Société des études byzantines et slaves,
St. Pétersbourg

SCRINIUM

Revue de patrologie, d'hagiographie critique
et d'histoire ecclésiastique

Tome 3

The Theophaneia School:
Jewish Roots of Eastern Christian Mysticism

Byzantinorossica
Saint-Pétersbourg
2007

Société des études byzantines et slaves,
St. Pétersbourg

SCRINIUM

Revue de patrologie, d'hagiographie critique
et d'histoire ecclésiastique

Tome 3

The Theophaneia School:
Jewish Roots of Eastern Christian Mysticism

Byzantinorossica
Saint-Pétersbourg
2007

ISSN 1817-7530 (Print)
ISSN 1817-7565 (Online)

http://scrinium.ru
http://byzantinorossica.org.ru/scrinium.html

ISBN 978-5-88483-063-9 (МЦФ)

ББК Э37–39(5)–117.3+Э37–39(6)–117.3
УДК 281.5

Scrinium. T. 3: The Theophaneia School: Jewish Roots of Eastern Christian Mysticism / Ed. by B. Lourié and A. Orlov (2007). — Санкт-Петербург: Византинороссика; Москва: МЦФ — Международный центр фантастики, 2007. — xl+504 с.

SCRINIUM

Revue de patrologie, d'hagiographie critique et d'histoire ecclésiastique

Comité éditorial:

B. Lourié (rédacteur en chef), St. Pétersbourg
D. Nosnitsin (secrétaire), Hamburg
D. Kashtanov, Moscow
S. Mikheev, Moscow
A. Orlov, Milwaukee
T. Senina, St. Pétersbourg
D. Y. Shapira, Jérusalem
S. Shoemaker, Oregon

Secrétariat:

T. Senina, St. Pétersbourg
E. Bormotova, Montréal

T. III: The Theophaneia School:
Jewish Roots of Eastern Christian Mysticism

Eds. Basil Lourié and Andrei Orlov

© Authors, 2007
© B. Lourié, A. Orlov 2007
© Byzantinorossica, 2007

Санкт-Петербургское Общество
византино-славянских исследований

SCRINIUM

Журнал патрологии, критической агиографии
и церковной истории

Том 3

Богословская школа «Theophaneia»: иудейские корни восточнохристианского мистицизма

Византинороссика
Санкт-Петербург
2007

SCRINIUM

Журнал патрологии, критической агиографии и церковной истории

Редакционная коллегия:

В. М. Лурье (главный редактор), Санкт-Петербург
Д. А. Носницин (секретарь), Гамбург
Д. В. Каштанов, Москва
С. М. Михеев, Москва
А. А. Орлов, Милуоки
Т. А. Сенина, Санкт-Петербург
Д. Шапира, Иерусалим
С. Шумейкер, Орегон

Секретариат:

Т. А. Сенина, Санкт-Петербург
Е. М. Бормотова, Монреаль

Т. III: Богословская школа «Theophaneia»: иудейские корни восточнохристианского мистицизма

Под редакцией В. М. Лурье и А. А. Орлова

© Авторы статей, 2007
© В. М. Лурье, А. А. Орлов (составление), 2007
© Византинороссика, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents vii

В. М. Лурье. Theophaneia School: *Экфрасис* Небесного Храма ix

B. Lourié. The Theophaneia School: An *Ekphrasis* of the Heavenly Temple ... xiii

Hieromonk Alexander (Golitzin). Theophaneia:
Forum on the Jewish Roots of Orthodox Spirituality xvii

Hieromonk Alexander (Golitzin). Christian Mysticism *Over* Two Millenia .. xxi

List of Abbreviations xxxiv

Location of the Original Publications xxxix

Part One: Christian Texts

Bogdan G. Bucur. The Angelomorphic Spirit in Early Christianity:
Revelation, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, Clement of Alexandria 3

Dragoş-Andrei Giulea. Seeking to See Him at the Festival of Pascha:
Glory-Soteriology in Early Christian Paschal Materials
and Rabbinic Literature 30

Hieromonk Alexander (Golitzin). «The Demons Suggest
an Illusion of God's Glory in a Form»: Controversy over the Divine Body
and Vision of Glory in Some Late Fourth, Early Fifth Century
Monastic Literature 49

Hieromonk Alexander (Golitzin). Dionysius Areopagites
in the Works of Saint Gregory Palamas: On the Question
of a «Christological Corrective» and Related Matters 83

Hieromonk Alexander (Golitzin). The Body of Christ:
Saint Symeon the New Theologian on Spiritual Life
and the Hierarchical Church 106

Hieromonk Alexander (Golitzin). Dionysius Areopagites:
A Christian Mysticism? 128

Hieromonk Alexander (Golitzin). The Image and Glory of God
in Jacob of Serug's Homily, «On That Chariot
That Ezekiel the Prophet Saw» 180

Andrei Orlov, Alexander Golitzin. «Many Lamps are Lightened
from the One»: Paradigms of the Transformational Vision
in the Macarian Homilies 213

Part Two: Jewish Texts

Andrei A. Orlov. «Without Measure and Without Analogy»:
The Tradition of the Divine Body in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* 233

Silviu N. Bunta. Too Vast to Fit in the World: Moses, Adam,
and צלם אלהים in the *Testament of Moses* 11:8 258

Andrei A. Orlov. Celestial Choirmaster: The Liturgical Role
of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch* and the Merkabah Tradition 279

Andrei A. Orlov. The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary
in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob* 303

Andrei A. Orlov. Ex 33 on God's Face:
A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition 323

Andrei A. Orlov. On The Polemical Nature of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*:
A Reply to C. Böttrich 337

Silviu N. Bunta. The *Mēsu*-Tree and the Animal Inside:
Theomorphism and Theriomorphism in Daniel 4 364

Andrei A. Orlov. Resurrection of Adam's Body:
The Redeeming Role of Enoch-Metatron in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* 385

Andrei A. Orlov. The Origin of the Name «Metatron»
and the Text of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* 390

Andrei A. Orlov. Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* 397

Andrei A. Orlov. Overshadowed by Enoch's Greatness:
«Two Tablets» Traditions from the *Book of Giants* to *Palaea Historica* . 412

Andrei A. Orlov. Secrets of Creation in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* 432

Andrei A. Orlov. The Heirs of the Enochic Lore:
«Men of Faith» in *2 Enoch* 35:2 and *Sefer Hekhalot* 48D:10 451

Andrei A. Orlov. Noah's Younger Brother Revisited:
Anti-Noachic Polemics and the Date of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* 464

Andrei A. Orlov. The Flooded Arboretums: The Garden Traditions
in the Slavonic Version of *3 Baruch* and the *Book of Giants* 481

THEOPHANEIA SCHOOL: *ЭКФРАСИС* НЕБЕСНОГО ХРАМА

«Авва Виссарион, умирая, говорил: монах, подобно херувимам и серафимам, должен быть весь оком» (*Apophthegmata Patrum*, *Виссарион* 11).

Авва Виссарион тут не просто говорил, а цитировал. Быть может, он цитировал автора *Corpus Macarianum* (которого мы, вслед за А. Г. Дунаевым, считаем нужным отождествить с Симеоном Месопотамским[1]), а еще вероятнее — общую традицию, одинаково авторитетную и для монашества Египта, к которому принадлежал авва Виссарион, и для монашества Сирии, в среде которого был написан *Corpus Macarianum*.

Речь идет об аскетическом толковании колесницы Божией в видении Иезекииля (Иез., гл. 1), которое мы теперь подробнее всего можем прочитать в той из макариевых бесед, которой открывается собрание типа II. Там, в частности, сказано:

> «Ибо душа, которую Дух, уготовавший ее в седалище и обитель Себе, сподобил приобщиться славы света Его, и осиял красотою неизреченной славы Своея, делается вся светом, вся лицем, вся оком; нет у нее ни одной части, не исполненной духовных очей света, то есть нет в ней ничего омраченного, но вся она всецело соделана светом и духом, вся исполнена очей, и не имеет никакой последней или задней стороны, но отовсюду представляется лицем, потому что снизошла на нее и восседит на ней неизреченная красота славы Света-Христа».[2]

Душа превращается в небесную колесницу, возносящуюся к своему природному месту — к Святому Святых Небесного Храма, где колесница, виденная Иезекиилем, занимает свое законное место Ковчега Завета, то есть Престола Божия…

Вся эта «мистика *меркабы* (колесницы)» — хорошо знакома христианам из Ветхого Завета и из продолжающих Ветхий Завет, но сохранен-

---

[1] См. монографию А. Г. Дунаева в составе: Преподобный Макарий Египетский, *Духовные слова и послания. Собрание типа I (Vatic. graec. 694)* / Издание подготовил А. Г. Дунаев (М., 2007[2]) (в печати). В этом же томе моя рецензия на первое издание, вышедшее в 2002 г. А. Г. Дунаев возвращается к старой гипотезе H. Dörries относительно авторства Симеона, но теперь убедительно, как мне представляется, доказывает ее на основании новых данных.

[2] Собрание II, беседа 1. Критическое издание: H. Dörries, E. Klostermann, M. Kroeger, Die 50 geistlichen Homilien des Makarios (Berlin, 1964) (Patristische Texte und Studien, 4) 1–2. Рус. пер.: Преподобнаго отца нашего Макария Египетскаго Духовные беседы, послания и слова, с присовокуплением сведений о жизни его и писаниях / Переведены с греческого при Московской Духовной Академии (Свято-Троицкая Сергиева Лавра, 1904[4]; репр. 1994) 3–4.

ных только в христианской традиции произведений эпохи Второго Храма. Но что она делает в христианстве? Не является ли обращение к этой традиции у автора макариевых бесед просто случайным рецидивом иудейской традиции?

Не является. Отчасти это можно заметить из слов египетского, а не сирийского отца, аввы Виссариона, с которых мы начали это предисловие. По крайней мере, для раннего монашества эта традиция была одинаково универсальной и в Сирии, и в Египте.

Когда-то, до того, как христианство заговорило на греческом философском языке, именно символический язык богослужения иудейского Храма был его универсальным языком — в том числе и даже прежде всего для выражения христианской догматики. Этот язык продолжает безраздельно господствовать у авторов Нового Завета и остается еще весьма актуальным для христианской богословской литературы II века. Но уже в том же II веке, в творениях христианских апологетов, ситуация меняется: при изложении христианского вероучения язык греческой философии всё более вытесняет иудейский литургический символизм. Начиная с IV века, по любому вопросу христианской догматики создаются обширные трактаты, где обсуждение ведется исключительно в терминах, преемственно связанных с античной греческой философией, без всякой апелляции к литургическому символизму.[3]

Это не означает, будто литургический символизм был забыт, хотя бы только при изложении догматики. Но исторически получилось так, что научная патрология развивалась, исходя из такого понимания вещей — будто христианство эллинизировалось целиком и отказалось от своих иудейских культурных корней. Если что-то и оставалось на долю иудейских символов, то лишь в области поэтических метафор, время от времени проскальзывавших в церковной гимнографии и в аскетической литературе. Согласно такому подходу (а он господствует в научной патрологии и до настоящего времени), при анализе как догматических, так и аскетических творений святых отцов ссылки на ветхозаветные символы небесной колесницы (меркабы), Скинии, Храма и храмового богослужения должны рассматриваться в одном ряду с риторическими приемами и стилистическими украшениями. При попытке выплавить из «руды» богословских трактатов догматический смысл все подобные украшения должны быть отброшены как шлак.

Первым, кто посмотрел на всю эту проблематику принципиально иначе, был Александр Голицын — главный автор настоящего сборника и основатель Theophaneia School, сформировавшейся вокруг него в Marquette University в Милуоках (США).

[3] Процесс становления этой традиции мы отчасти проследили в кн.: В. М. Лурье, История византийской философии. Формативный период (СПб., 2006).

Первой серьезной заявкой на создание нового научного направления стала монография Голицына о Дионисии Ареопагите.[4] Дионисий Ареопагит оказался одновременно предельно удобным и предельно неудобным для отработки новой методики прочтения патристических текстов. Предельно удобным — так как редко можно найти автора, столь эксплицитно использующего литургический символизм именно для формулировок догматики. Предельно неудобным — так как культурно это был автор, гораздо сильнее связанный с традициями платонизма, литургическими в том числе (у Прокла), нежели с традициями иудейскими. По крайней мере, его платонистические связи лежат на поверхности, а его иудейская основа запрятана глубоко и, во многом, даже глубже, чем простирается анализ Голицына.[5]

Применительно к Дионисию Ареопагиту подход Голицына стал одним из путей, позволивших пересмотреть концепцию его любимого учителя, Иоанна Мейендорфа (1926–1992), относительно «христологического корректива», внесенного, по мнению Мейендорфа, в понимание Ареопагита у Максима Исповедника и Григория Паламы. Если читать Дионисия Ареопагита на том языке литургического символизма, на котором он написан, то христологию *Ареопагитик* невозможно упустить из внимания, и тогда становится ясно, что *Ареопагитики* в «христологическом коррективе» не нуждались, будучи и без того вполне внутренне христологичны. Голицын более прицельно пишет об этом в одной из статей настоящего сборника («Dionysius Areopagites in the Works of Saint Gregory Palamas: On the question of "Christological Corrective" and related matters»).

---

[4] Hieromonk Alexander (Golitzin), *Et introibo ad altare Dei*. The Mystagogy of Dionysius Areopagita, with Special Reference to its Predecessors in the Eastern Christian Tradition (Θεσσαλονίκη, 1994) ('Ανάλεκτα Βλατάδων, 59).

[5] С чисто исторической точки зрения, на мой взгляд, следует связывать появление *Corpus Areopagiticum* с актуализацией иудео-христианских преданий, связанных с Успением Богоматери, в Палестине середины и второй половины V века. Об этом см., главным образом, M. van Esbroeck, Peter the Iberian and Dionysius the Areopagite: Honigmann's thesis revisited // *OCP* 59 (1993) 217–227; дополнительно: В. М. Лурье, Время поэтов, или *Praeparationes Areopagiticae*: к уяснению происхождения стихотворной парафразы Евангелия от Иоанна // Нонн из Хмима. *Деяния Иисуса* / Отв. ред. Д. А. Поспелов (М., 2002) (Scrinium Philocalicum, I) 295–337. Перепечатано (с небольшими исправлениями) под названием «Дионисийский субстрат в византийском юродстве. Время поэтов, или Praeparationes Areopagiticae» в: *Amsterdam International Journal for Cultural Narratology* (2005) N 1, Spring: The Many Faces of Narratological Agenda. Research Application to Literatures and Cultures vis-a-vis History and Tropology: http://cf.hum.uva.nl/narratology/lurie.htm

Но гораздо более плодотворным метод Голицына оказался впоследствии — при обращении к аскетической литературе и, в частности, к догматическим спорам, возникавшим в связи с аскетикой. Отчасти формированию нового метода помогло обращение к ранним сирийским отцам, особенно Афраату, которые еще и в IV веке продолжали существовать в густой иудео-христианской среде, понимание которой стало приходить в 1960-е и особенно в 1970-е годы, на одно научное поколение раньше Голицына. Видимо, труды Антуана Гийомона (Antoine Guillaumont, 1915–2000) и поныне здравствующего Роберта Мюррея (Robert Murray), посвященные иудео-христианскому бэкграунду коптского и, в особенности, сирийского христианства и монашества пришли в необыкновенно удачный резонанс с прежними интуициями Александра Голицына, сформировавшимися на основе византийской патристической традиции.

Так и появились на свет те идеи, с которыми сейчас выступает Theophaneia School. Оказалось, что именно учет иудео-христианского «бэкграунда» позволяет понять суть таких вековых проблем патрологии, как, например, «антропоморфитские споры» в египетском монашестве. Или, например, учение Симеона Нового Богослова и других византийских отцов о духовном священстве, совершаемом в душе каждого верного, — оно понятно лишь в том случае, если всерьез принять представление о душе как о микрокосме и о макрокосме как о Небесном Храме: душа оказывается малым Храмом, полностью вмещающим Небесный Храм с его вечным священством. — Всем этим темам посвящены статьи настоящего сборника, написанные Александром Голицыным и его учениками, начиная с конца 1990-х годов. Оказалось, что язык иудейского литургического символизма в христианстве не только никогда не умирал, но и продолжал использоваться для изложения многих важнейших богословских идей, причем, иногда таких, которые на другом богословском языке так никогда и не были выражены.

Отдельная забота Theophaneia School — лучше понять саму «иудейскую матрицу» христианства: понять именно те традиции еще дохристианского иудаизма, которые христианством были востребованы. В этой области исследования Theophaneia School направляются Андреем Орловым, который, став первым прямым учеником Александра Голицына, положил начало формированию вокруг Голицына всей нынешней научной школы.

Цель издания настоящего тома — впервые собрать вместе некоторую «критическую массу» разбросанных ранее по различным изданиям статей, чтобы таким образом показать сам научный метод. — Метод изучения богословской традиции, выражавшей себя на языке богослужения Небесного Храма.

В. М. Лурье

THE THEOPHANEIA SCHOOL: AN *EKPHRASIS* OF THE HEAVENLY TEMPLE

«Before his death abba Bessarion said: "A monk, like the Cherubim and the Seraphim, must be all eye"».[1] This was not Abba Bessarion's own saying, but a citation from another source. He was possibly citing from the *Corpus Macarianum* (the authorship of which, following A. G. Dunaev's hypothesis, can be identified with Simeon of Mesopotamia),[2] but more likely he was drawing on the common tradition that held equal authority in both Egyptian monasticism, to which abba Bessarion belonged, and Syrian monasticism where the *Corpus Macarianum* was written.

Abba Bessarion's saying appropriates the ascetic interpretation of the prophet Ezekiel's vision of the Divine Chariot, the detailed account of which can be also found in one of the Macarian Homilies in the beginning of the Collection II. The relevant passage of the homily reads:

> For the soul that is deemed to be judged worthy to participate in the light of the Holy Spirit by becoming his throne and habitation, and is covered with the beauty of ineffable glory of the Spirit, becomes all light, all face, all eye. There is no part of the soul that is not full of the spiritual eyes of light. That is to say, there is no part of the soul that is covered with darkness but is totally covered with spiritual eyes of light. For the soul has no imperfect part but is in every part on all sides facing forward and covered with the beauty of the ineffable glory of the light of Christ, who mounts and rides upon the soul.[3]

Here, the human soul is transformed into the Divine Chariot that ascends to its original place in the Holy of Holies of the Heavenly Temple, the legitimate place of the Ark of Covenant, portrayed in the vision of Ezekiel as the Divine Throne...

Merkabah mysticism (literally, «the mysticism of the Divine Chariot») was well-known to Christians from the books of the Old Testament and other Second Temple Jewish non-biblical writings preserved solely in the Chris-

---

[1] *Apophthegmata Patrum*, Bessarion 11.

[2] See Dunaev's monograph in: Преподобный Макарий Египетский, *Духовные слова и послания. Собрание типа I (Vatic. graec. 694)* / Изд. подг. А. Г. Дунаев (М., 2007²) (forthcoming). This volume also contains my review of the first edition of the book. In his monograph A. G. Dunaev revisits the old hypothesis of H. Dörries about the authorship of Simeon, convincingly supporting it with new evidence.

[3] Collection II, Homily 1. Critical edition: H. Dörries, E. Klostermann, M. Kroeger, Die 50 geistlichen Homilien des Makarios (Berlin, 1964) (Patristische Texte und Studien, 4) 1–2. English translation: Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter* / Tr. G. A. Maloney, S.J. (New York, 1992) 37.

tian tradition. What role did this mystical teaching play in Christianity? Could this mystical saying cited by the author of the Macarian Homilies simply be a coincidental recurrence of the Jewish tradition?

No, it could not be coincidental. Partial evidence can be found in the saying of abba Bessarion with which we began our introduction. Given his Egyptian rather than Syrian abode, it is clear that, at least, in early monasticism this mystical tradition was equally universal in Syria, as well as in Egypt.

Long before the Greek philosophical vocabulary became the standard conceptual vehicle of Christian doctrine, Christians natively and universally drew on the symbolic liturgical language of the Jewish Temple. This language is dominant among New Testament authors and remains influential in the Christian literature of the second century A.D. A rapid paradigm shift, however, occurs in the second century, in the works of the Apologists who increasingly resort to the language of Greek philosophy and shy away from Jewish symbolism in their exposition of the Christian faith. Starting from the fourth century A.D., every question of Christian doctrine becomes a subject of lengthy treatises parsed exclusively in the terms of ancient Greek philosophy, without any reference to the liturgical symbolism.[4]

This does not mean of course that the liturgical symbolism was completely forgotten in the formulation of Christian doctrine. Still, historically patristic scholarship developed with an understanding that Christianity had been totally Hellenized and had fully rejected its Jewish cultural roots. The use of Jewish symbolism was visible only in poetic metaphors scantily interspersed in Church hymnography and ascetic literature. According to this approach, which still reins even in contemporary patristic scholarship, all references to the Old Testament symbolism conveyed through the imagery of the Divine Chariot (the Merkabah), the Holy of Holies, the Temple, or the details of the temple worship found in dogmatic and ascetical works of the Church fathers should be interpreted as rhetorical devices and stylistic embellishments. Any serious student wishing to get to the dogmatic core of patristic theology must treat this verbal cosmetics as pointless husk.

The first scholar to offer a substantively different perspective on these critical issues was Alexander Golitzin, the main author of the current collection and the founder of the Theophaneia School that emerged around him at Marquette University in Milwaukee (USA).

Golitzin's first serious effort to develop a new interpretive framework in this field of studies was his monograph on Dionysius Areopagita.[5] Dionysius

[4] For the partial discussion of this process, see: V. M. Lourié, *History of Byzantine Philosophy: Formative Period* (St.-Petersburg, 2006) (in Russian) [В. М. Лурье, *История византийской философии. Формативный период* (СПб., 2006)].

[5] Hieromonk Alexander (Golitzin), *Et introibo ad altare Dei.* The Mystagogy of Dionysius Areopagita, with Special Reference to its Predecessors in the Eastern Christian Tradition (Θεσσαλονίκη, 1994) (Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων, 59).

Areopagita became at one and the same time the most convenient and the most inconvenient source for testing a fresh methodology of reading patristic texts. He was most convenient, because few other authors drew on liturgical symbolism so saliently in their formulation of Christian dogma. And he was most inconvenient, because his own cultural heritage had stronger connections to platonic rather than Jewish traditions. At the least, the platonic connections of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* lie on the surface while its Jewish core is deeply concealed, in many respects even more deeply than is shown in Golitzin's analysis.[6]

Golitzin's approach to Dionysius Areopagita was one of the routes leading to a reconsideration of the conception of the «Christological corrective» developed, according to Golitzin's favorite teacher, John Meyendorff (1926–1992), by Maximus the Confessor and Gregory Palamas for understanding Dionysius. If, however, one reads Dionysius Areopagita in the language of liturgical symbolism in which it was originally written, the text's Christology is impossible to miss, and it becomes clear that the *Corpus Areopagiticum* does not require any «Christological corrective» since it already is internally Christological. Golitzin discusses this issue in detail in one of his articles included in the current collection, «Dionysius Areopagites in the Works of Saint Gregory Palamas: On the Question of "Christological Corrective" and Related Matters».

Golitzin's methodology proved to be even more prolific when it was later applied to the ascetic literature, and in particular, to the dogmatic controversies surrounding asceticism. The formation of the new methodology was partly helped by Golitizin's turn to early Syrian fathers, especially to Aphrahat, the Christian authors who flourished even in the fourth century A.D amid the dense Jewish-Christian environment. The appreciation of the Jewish-Christian character of the Syrian fathers began in 1960s and especially in 1970s, a generation before Golitzin. The works of Antoine Guillaumont (1915–2000)

[6] I think that from the historical point of view, the appearance of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* was closely connected with the revival of the Jewish-Christian lore about the Dormition of the Theotokos that was taking place in Palestine in the middle and the second half of the fifth century. See M. van Esbroeck, Peter the Iberian and Dionysius the Areopagite: Honigmann's thesis revisited // *OCP* 59 (1993) 217–227. See also В. М. Лурье, Время поэтов, или *Praeparationes Areopagiticae*: к уяснению происхождения стихотворной парафразы Евангелия от Иоанна, в: Нонн из Хмима. *Деяния Иисуса* / Отв. ред. Д. А. Поспелов (М., 2002) (Scrinium Philocalicum. Т. I) 295–337. Republished with small corrections under the title «Дионисийский субстрат в византийском юродстве. Время поэтов, или Praeparationes Areopagiticae» in: *Amsterdam International Journal for Cultural Narratology* (2005) N 1, Spring: The Many Faces of Narratological Agenda. Research Application to Literatures and Cultures vis-a-vis History and Tropology: http://cf.hum.uva.nl/narratology/lurie.htm

and Robert Murray focusing on the Jewish-Christian background of Coptic, and in particular, Syrian Christianity and monasticism reached a remarkably successful resonance with the existing intuitions of Golitzin, acquired during his studies of the Byzantine patristic tradition.

Such has been the course of development of the ideas currently advocated by the Theophaneia School. It is now apparent that such long-lasting patristic «puzzles» as, for example, the «anthropomorphite controversy» in the history of Egyptian monasticism can be properly understood only against their Judeo-Christian background. Or consider the teaching of Symeon the New Theologian and other Byzantine fathers about the spiritual priesthood in the soul of every believer. This teaching can be understood only if one sees a human soul as the microcosm corresponding to the macrocosm of the Heavenly Temple — the human soul is a smaller Temple that mysteriously encompasses the Heavenly Temple with its eternal priesthood.

All these themes receive attention in the articles of the current volume written by Alexander Golitzin and his disciples starting from the late 1990s. Their work has made clear that the language of Jewish liturgical symbolism has never died in Christianity and has continued to be used for expressing many vital theological ideas, some of which have never been articulated in other doctrinal schemes.

One of the principal tasks of the Theophaneia School is to better understand the Jewish «matrix» of Christianity, further exploring the range and nature of the Jewish mystical traditions appropriated by Christian authors. This part of the Theophaneia School's research is guided by Andrei Orlov who has become the first and closest disciple of Alexander Golitzin, assisting his teacher in the formation of a new theological school.

The purpose of this volume is to gather together for the first time a certain «critical mass» of publications, otherwise dispersed in various journals, in order to demonstrate a new scholarly method — the method of investigating the theological tradition that chose to express itself in the liturgical language of the Heavenly Temple.

Basil Lourié

Hieromonk Alexander (Golitzin)

THEOPHANEIA: FORUM ON THE JEWISH ROOTS OF ORTHODOX SPIRITUALITY

Theophany is at the heart of Orthodox Tradition. It is what the Christian East has always understood as the very content of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The word means, literally, the manifestation or appearance of God: God become visible. God's appearances mark or indeed comprise the key moments of the sacred history: Adam hides from God walking in the Garden; Jacob sees the ladder to heaven at Bethel and God presiding over it and the angels; the same Patriarch wrestles with the Angel of the Lord at Penuel and receives the name, Israel; Moses is accorded the Name at the burning bush; the divine Presence as the fiery Glory rides in the pillar of cloud leading Israel out of Egypt, descends on Sinai at the giving of the Covenant, appears as a king enthroned before Moses and the Elders of Israel at the Covenant meal, and then again alone to Moses alone on the mountain's peak, overshadows the newly-constructed tabernacle at the end of the book of Exodus, and descends as «fire from heaven» to consume the sacrifice at the tabernacle's consecration in Leviticus. The Glory appears again at the consecration of Solomon's temple, where Isaiah later sees the King of heaven enthroned. Ezekiel is favored with the vision of the Glory «in likeness as a man» riding the chariot throne, sees the same depart the Temple on the eve of its destruction, and then re-enter it on the occasion of its eschatological restoration. From the Temple, according to the prophets, God's Glory will appear at the end of days so that «all flesh shall see it» (cf. Isa 40:5; Mal 3:1). These theophanies are what will then illumine the meaning of Jesus Messiah for the New Testament writers, who will recognize him as the definitive appearance of God, the Immanuel, born from the «Power of the Most High overshadowing» the Virgin (Lk 1:35), and declared «the light to the nations and Glory of Israel» by righteous Symeon. St. Paul calls him «the form of God», and the Fourth Gospel says «we have seen his glory» when «he tabernacled among us». He is revealed to the three Apostles on Mount Tabor as the Glory who appeared to Moses on Sinai, and who spoke to Elijah on Horeb (I K 19). Isaiah «saw his Glory», says the Fourth Gospel, referring to the prophet's Temple vision, while the Synoptic Gospels present Christ's death as parting the Temple veil, and his exaltation as ascent to the right hand of the Father on the divine throne, where Stephen the first-martyr sees him (Acts 7) in the same splendor that John the Seer will see illumining the city and world to come (Rev 21–22).

Theophany permeates Orthodox tradition throughout, informing its dogmatic theology and its liturgy. That Jesus, Mary's son, is the very One who appeared to Moses and the prophets — this is the consistent witness of the ante-Nicene Fathers, and remains foundational throughout the fourth-century, Trinitarian controversies and the later Christological disputes. From its beginnings, the Church's liturgy has been understood as the mirror of heaven revealing «the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem» (Heb 12:22). It is «the icon of the divine beauty», according to St. Dionysius Areopagites, and «the exact image of heaven». As a modern Orthodox abbot writes: «There is a single living and moving image of the glory of Christ which becomes present in our worship...He who sits enthroned there, in heaven, is also here, upon the cherubim, with fire and radiance of light». This visible manifestation of God and of the world of heaven which is the liturgy «becomes», according to the same writer, «our life, bread, light, river of life, voices as of cataracts, just as above in heaven». We see and eat «the bread of angels» (Ps 78:25), «the living bread come down from heaven» (Jn 6:50–51).

Moses came from Sinai «with shining face» (Ex 34:29–35), a likeness of God, indeed himself a theophany, and a promise thus which Orthodoxy has always understood as, in Christ, extended to all humanity. Theophany is therefore also at the heart of Orthodox soteriology and spirituality, an emphasis encapsulated by the later use of the Greek word, *theosis*, and already adumbrated by the New Testament writers: from the shadow of the Apostle curing the sick and possessed (Acts 5:15), to Stephen's face «as the face of an angel», to St. Paul's assurance of the Glory abiding within the believer (2 Cor 3:18–4:6), to our Lord's promise of the same in the Gospel of John (Jn 17:5, 22–24). The line of witnesses continues through the martyrs and ascetics of the early centuries, to the holy monks, such as St. Anthony coming forth from his fortress retreat like «an angel of light» (*Vita Antonii*, Syriac version), or Abba Macarius the Great «like a god on earth... covering the sins of the brethren», or the radiant faces of Abbas Sisoes, Pambo, and Silvanus, and on down the generations to Saints Symeon the New Theologian, Gregory of Sinai, and Sabbas of Vatopedi, to Seraphim Sarovsky, and on to the presently circulating testimonies about contemporary saints of Mount Athos and elsewhere in the Orthodox world. The line of witnesses is continuous, consistent, and centers on the good news of God made present and visible in Jesus of Nazareth, in the Church's worship, and in her saints.

There is, however, one break in that continuity. While the witness continues uninterrupted in the liturgical texts, in hagiography, in the practice of the monasteries and especially of the hermitages, the formal, academic theology taught in Orthodox schools since the latters' formation in the wake of — and responding to — the Western European Reformation and Counter-Reformation has for long lost sight of this essential, theophanic thread. Some have described post-Byzantine Orthodox theology as without its own voice, re-

duced to using Protestant arguments against Roman Catholics, and vice-versa. Others have referred to a «Babylonian Captivity» of Orthodox thought, or of its «pseudo-morphosis». What is incontestable is a certain loss of consciousness, at least in our schools and manuals, of what we have been sketching here. The twentieth century saw a remarkable effort on the part of some Orthodox theologians to recover an awareness of the Traditions, of its proper voice and vision. We would see this effort embodied chiefly (though not exclusively) in the scholarly movement that the late Fr. Georges Florovsky called «the neo-patristic synthesis», which has included theologians from the Russian emigration, from Greece, Romania, and Serbia.

Our seminar wishes to build on the work of these scholars, but with much greater attention devoted to an area where we believe their work was lacking: the patrimony of biblical and post-biblical Israel. It is from the latter that Christianity itself arose, and, equally, it is from the great pool of Israel's traditions and imagery that, from the New Testament writers to the end of the Byzantine era and beyond, the Church has continued to draw in order to frame her dogmas, to voice her praises, to understand her vocation, and to describe the Christian calling as embodied in her saints. No one who has seriously studied patristic exegesis, or ancient theological controversy, or the liturgy, or the writings of the neptic fathers can have missed the overwhelming presence of exactly those images and texts that we sketched or alluded to in our opening paragraph. Yet, neither in the older school theology that has haunted our seminaries, nor even (with some exceptions) among the advocates of the «neo-patristic synthesis» do the great theophanies either of Israel, or of the New Testament (save the Transfiguration) enjoy the prominent, indeed central role that they should have, and that they do have in the Fathers, in the liturgical texts, and in the spiritual writers. Perhaps one, neglected indication of the difference obtaining between the ancients and the monks, on the one hand, and modern Orthodox academics struggling to articulate the Tradition, on the other hand, is the enormous library of pseudepigraphical and apocryphal materials from post-biblical Israel and Christian antiquity that was continuously copied and presumably valued — though seldom quoted — by Eastern Christians, and especially by their monks. Our fathers in God apparently thought these documents worthy of the considerable attention necessary to copy them, but one would be hard-pressed to find a single, contemporary Orthodox theologian who devotes any significant space whatever to their consideration.

Beginning from this one, seemingly minor point, we look to recent developments in the study of apocalyptic literature, of the Qumran Scrolls, of Gnosticsm, and of later Jewish mysticism, which we believe point to lines of inquiry that we are convinced throw new and welcome light on the sources and continuities of Orthodox theology, liturgy, and spirituality. Here we must salute the labors sixty years ago of the Jewish scholar, Gershom Scholem, who

sought successfully to demonstrate the continuities of Jewish mystical literature from the ancient apocalypses, through the Talmudic-era *hekhalot* texts, to medieval Cabbala. This thesis has had an extraordinarily fruitful effect on the several fields noted above. To cite but one example, and one which is or should be immediately relevant to Orthodox students of theology, there is the study on St. Paul published in 1992 by another Jewish scholar, Alan Segal. Without any references to Eastern Christian writers, or any ostensible knowledge of them, but on the basis of Scholem's thesis of continuities, Professor Segal constructs an account of the Apostle's Christology, ecclesiology, soteriology, and mysticism which is stunningly reminiscent of nothing so much as the later Byzantine Hesychasts, right down to St. Gregory Palamas on the uncreated light which streams from the face of the transfigured Christ, and which is present and available to Christians even now, if partially, in the present life. Prominent as well in this modern scholar's work, as before in Scholem, and together with the publications of the many others who are working in the latter's train, is the presence of exactly those pseudepigrapha and apocrypha cherished by generations of Orthodox monks. We do not believe this to be coincidence, nor of minor import, but rather an indication of where we should ourselves be looking in order to trace the continuities of the Great Tradition, and to demonstrate its roots in the Israel of the Revelation.

To sum up: we understand our work as directed at once *ad intra*, to our fellow Orthodox, and *ad extra*, to the larger scholarly world. We hope to stimulate and enourage Orthodox students of theology to look again to the same sources which moved the great Fathers of the Church, and the holy monks. By those sources we mean first and foremost the canonical scriptures, but, in addition, also that great penumbra of witness which, while occasionally odd or even perverse (thus Gnostics and Manichees), still bears vital testimony to traditions that we meet in the writings of the Fathers and embodied in our saints, both in the distant past and in the present day. The latter, the saints, are indeed the true lens through which we read the ancient texts, and in whom we find the witness of those old documents verified and illumined. To the world outside the Orthodox Church, especially to the scholarly world, we offer our work as at once an apology — in the sense of an explanation and a defense — for Orthodox theology and spirituality, and as a labor in common with, first of all, our brothers and sisters in Christianity, who are also seeking out the origins of the Faith once received by the Apostles; and, secondly, with Jewish scholars who are exploring continuities with their own past; and to both we acknowledge ourselves profoundly indebted. They have helped us, and they continue to help us discover ourselves. We hope in our turn to return the favor.

Hieromonk Alexander (Golitzin)

CHRISTIAN MYSTICISM *OVER* TWO MILLENIA

I. Introductory Remarks: The Need for a New Approach to Eastern Christian Spirituality

Spirituality is a recent and difficult word. Broadly speaking, it seems in a Christian context usually to denote the attitudes and practices of piety, and is often though not inevitably considered in relative isolation from theology proper. One may and does thus in a Western Christian setting speak of spiritualities in the plural, a point to which this essay will return in its conclusions. When such an approach is taken to the Christian East, however, serious problems and distortions arise. The enormously influential article written sixty-five years ago by Father Irenée Hausherr, «The Main Currents of Eastern Christian Spirituality», is a case in point. Hausherr's taxonomy of Eastern spirituality amounted in sum to projection onto early and Byzantine-era monastic writers of the categories to which he was accustomed from the Medieval and post-Medieval, Counter-Reformation West: «intellective» versus «affective» mysticisms, versus spiritualities featuring sober obedience, or Neoplatonist ecstasies, or the peculiarly poisonous (for Hausherr) combination of the first, second, and fourth of these earlier «schools» in the 14th century Byzantine Hesychasts. The unfortunate fact that it is precisely Hausherr's categorizations which are reflected in virtually every single major study or compendium of Eastern Christian spirituality to have been published since his article appeared has led to endless confusion and misapprehension.

The latter fact makes the assignment confronting this essay daunting: the sketch of a new approach to Eastern Christian spirituality which must try to do justice at once to recent advances in scholarship, and to the thrust and continuity of the Eastern traditon itself. The word «sketch» must stressed, for what follows can be no more than the barest outline, offered in the hope that succeeding and more extensive studies will appear in future to flesh it out. Just over two millenia cannot be treated otherwise in the space of a few thousand words. Saying *over* two millenia is to assert the thesis the present essay seeks to present: that Eastern Christian asceticism and monasticism — i.e., Eastern spirituality, in short — arose out of an original matrix in the pre-Christian era of Second Temple Judaism. As Ernst Käsemann remarked some decades ago, Jewish apocalyptic literature is «the mother of all Christian theology». The same holds for that theology as expressed in praxis, which is to say, in spirituality.

II. Scripture, Asceticism and Transfiguration in Second Temple Jewish Apocalyptic and Early Christianity

Asceticism does not feature prominently in the Hebrew books of the Old Testament, save in the temporary celibacy imposed by holy war (e.g., 2 Sam 11:10–11), preparation for theophany (Ex 19:15; cf. 34:28 on fasting), and, related to the latter, service in the Temple (Lev 15:2–15), or in the fasts, tears, and sackcloth which are the tangible expressions of repentance (e.g., Jonah 3:6 ff.). In the so-called «intertestamental» or Second Temple era, however, and particularly in the two centuries before and after the birth of Christ, one finds testimony to traditions that would carry on both in Rabbinic literature, and, in Christianity, through the New Testament period to the fourth century emergence and self-definition of Christian monasticism as the East has know the latter ever since. The precise lines of this continuity have yet to be charted in any single study, but virtually all the raw materials are present for the realization of such a work in the existing scholarly editions of primary texts and the accompanying secondary literature. Briefly, the apocalypses which feature an ascent or «heavenly journey», to use the phrase of John Collins and other recent scholars of the apocalyptic genre, and which appear as early as ca. 200 B.C. with *1 Enoch*, display certain common features, including: 1) a preparatory ascetical praxis, involving fasting, mourning, constant prayer, often at least temporary celibacy, and prostrations; 2) the ascent to the heavenly palace or temple, and therein to the throne of God; 3) initiation into the mysteries of heaven and creation; 4) the acquisition of, or transformation into angelic status, by virtue of which 5) the visionary becomes a concelebrant of the liturgy of heaven, and 6) is accorded a vision of the divine Glory; in order 7) to return to earth bearing a unique authority and message concerning the things of God. To employ a phrase from later, Byzantine monastic literature, the apocalyptic seer becomes an «earthly angel and heavenly man», initiate and initiator, the priest of the heavenly mysteries.

This is the original model for the sainted elder, the *geron* or *staretz*, of Eastern Christian literature, from Athanasius of Alexandria's portrait of the «father of monks» in *The Life of Anthony*, to Dostoyevsky's *Staretz* Zossima in *The Brothers Karamazov*. In both the fourth century biography of Anthony and in the 19th century literary creation of Zossima, the Eastern Christian soteriological doctrine of *theosis*, deification, is fully present and, indeed, understood as incarnate. Here, in other words, is Eastern Christian doctrine and spirituality made visible, its paradigm and embodiment. Here is both the perennial theme of Eastern teaching and the key to its extraordinary continuity: the human being as called upon to be transfigured, to become him- or herself the revelation of the Glory of God, the presence of Immanuel, theophany.

The Gospel of the Risen Jesus compelled a certain parting of the ways with Christianity's Jewish matrix, but it would be wrong to exaggerate the extent of that rupture. The lines of continuity and discontinuity appear perhaps most clearly in the scriptural idea of the «temple». In biblical Israel, the temple is the locus of the divine presence, the *kevod YHWH* or «Glory of God», whose fiery manifestation appeared to Moses atop Sinai (Ex 24 and 33–34), and which took up residence with Israel first in the tabernacle (Ex 40), and then in Solomon's temple (I K 8). In the apocalyptic literature just mentioned, it is the heavenly or original temple and place of God which becomes the primary focus of attention, though not necessarily with prejudice to its earthly copy. When the temple is destroyed by the Roman legions in A.D. 70, Judaism carries on, looking first of all for God's Presence (*Shekinah*) with Israel in the holy books of the Torah as in a sort of portable temple (cf. Sirach 24), second in the gathering of Israel for worship in the synagogue, and third in the person of the sage or rabbi himself. In the New Testament and nascent Christianity, there is an analogous and parallel development. The great difference is the person of the Lord Jesus, who replaces temple and Torah as the primary «place» of the divine presence. He is himself the Glory or *Shekinah* who has «tabernacled among us» (Jn 1:14). His divinity is manifested at once on the mountain tops of Tabor, the Transfiguration, and of Golgotha, the Crucifixion, which become in turn the twin poles around which Eastern spirituality will revolve: suffering and splendor, humbling unto death and transfiguration, ascetic mortification and the *visio dei luminis*. Second, the worship of the assembly of the Church also becomes the temple (e.g., Eph 2:20–22), the place of the Risen One's presence and, with Him, of the heavenly Zion (Heb 12:18–24). Third, temple is also applied to the Christian him- or herself (1 Cor 6:19–20), who is called at once to share in the Cross and to be «transfigured from glory to glory» (2 Cor 3:18), to see within his or her heart the light of the Glory of God in the face of Christ (2 Cor 4:6). To borrow from a mid-fourth century, Syrian Christian ascetic work, the *Liber Graduum*, already in the New Testament one finds the adumbration of «three churches»: «the church on high», i.e., heaven and the heavenly liturgy around the throne of Christ God; «the church on earth», with its clergy and sacraments, and «the little church» of the heart or soul. Yet, in each «church», it is the same glorified Christ Who is made present by the action of the Spirit.

Between the New Testament era and the fourth century, pre-Nicene Christianity highlights as heroes and exemplars of the Faith both the martyr and the ascetic, for example in the second century *Shepherd of Hermas*, where martyrs and virgins stand, respectively, at the right and left hand of Christ enthroned. Ignatius of Antioch († ca. 115) and Polycaryp of Smyrna († ca. 165), together with Stephen in the Acts of the Apostles, are exemplary martyrdoms, where the martyr is transformed and becomes himself the locus of theo-

phany, thus Stephen's face «like the face of an angel» (Acts 6:15) and his vision of the heavenly throne (7:55–56), or Ignatius' suggested and Polycarp's explicit assimilation to the Eucharistic offering and presence. The ascetico-visionary continuum is particularly pronounced in the second century *Ascension of Isaiah* and *Gospel of Thomas*, with the latter providing the first literary attestation of the word «monk» (*monachos*) for the Christian ascetic, and the same basic line continues in both the second and third century Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, and — albeit in strange and twisted ways — in much of the literature of Gnosticism and of early Manicheanism as well. In all of these documents, motifs from pre-Christian apocalyptic literature are to the fore, and one should also take into account the fact that the older Jewish works, too, appear to have been continuously copied, read, and interpolated by Christian readers who, after the fourth century, were doubtless primarily monks. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha featured in the contemporary collection edited recently by J. H. Charlesworth would not have been preserved without the continuous Christian interest which extended well into medieval times and even beyond.

In Alexandria of the late second and third centuries, another layer is added to the Jewish-based ascetico-mystical tradition. This is the vast literature of pagan Greek philosophy, in particular of Platonism and Stoicism, with their attention to, and elaborate vocabulary for charting the training of the soul and the latter's struggle with the passions. In the persons of Clement (fl. 190–202) and Origen († 253) of Alexandria, this vocabulary enters permanently into the Greek Christian bloodstream. Clement's portrait of the «Christian Gnostic», and Origen's of the perfected teacher, are at once reponses to the heretical Gnosticism which flourished in Alexandria, and to the ancient tradtions of apocalyptic ascent and vision, which Origen in particular is anxious to internalize and frame within the vocabulary of philosophical discourse. The latter's treatise, *On Prayer*, is especially important and influential in this regard, relocating as it does the ascent, transformation, and *visio dei gloriae* of apocalyptic to the «inner man» of the soul.

III. The Fourth Century: Emergence of the Imperial Church, the Ecumenical Councils, and Monasticism

The conversion of the Emperor Constantine to Christianity is the first great watershed of the fourth century. The Ecumenical or, more accurately, Imperial Councils of Nicea (325) and Constantinople (381) are a direct result. The Creed which emerges from the councils seals Christianity's commitment to the philosophical lexicon of Greek antiquity with its consecration of the term, *homoousios* («consubstantial»), in application to the Second Person of the Trinity, a development which, in its turn, stimulates the furthering of Clement's and Origen's efforts to articulate the inner life of the Christian

in accordance with the same vocabulary. This project is clearly at work in the two most important episcopal spokesmen for and to the nascent monastic movement, Athanasius of Alexandria († 373) and Basil of Caesarea in Cappadocia († 379). The former's *Life of Anthony* and the latter's *Longer* and *Shorter Rules*, collections of his correspondence with ascetic communities in Cappadocia, exercise great influence in their overall efforts to keep the monks within the communion of the imperial church, focused on community and mutual charity, observant of the Church's common worship, and subordinate to the bishop's authority. Basil had in fact little use for solitaries of Anthony's type, but in this regard his judgement would not prevail. The hermit has remained a constant presence in Eastern spirituality, rare but never absent, and often celebrated.

The efforts of these two Church Fathers also reflected Christianity's new place in the Roman Empire. In parallel to the secular magistrates, the bishops, too, were accorded local authority and backed by imperial power. The, as it were, «ingathering» of the ascetics under the episcopal pallium is a part of this process. Likewise, the bishop's — and, by extension, the village priest's — altar becomes the focal point of the city or town. Here, and particularly in the capitol, is the birthplace of the imperial liturgy, embellished with the etiquette of the court and all the wealth and sophistication of the Empire's resources, which would later achieve definitive form in the rite of «the Great Church of Christ», *Hagia Sophia*, in Constantinople. Perhaps no polarity in Eastern Christian spirituality is more striking and more apparently contradictory than that of the hermit's stark poverty and simplicity, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the gorgeous splendor of the late Byzantine liturgy, dripping gold and conducted in the presence of mosaics and murals fabricated with all the expense and subtlety available to a millenial civilization. Yet, neither the hermit nor the episcopal celebrant would at all accept this as a paradox, let alone a contradiction. The former would — and does — understand the magnificence of the earthly church's liturgy as a mirror, both of the angels' worship in the heavenly temple before the throne of God, and of the divine presence within the purified heart. The bishop and, perhaps even more so, the devout laity see in their turn the Kingdom of God reflected equally in the glory of the Church's common worship, and in the hallowed ascetic elder, the *geron* or *staretz*, bright and fragrant already with presence of the world to come.

The first conscious coördination between the liturgies of heaven, earth, and the heart can be found in the ascetic literature of, especially, fourth century Christian Syria and Mesopotamia. Three writers are of particular note here: Ephrem Syrus († 373), and the anonymous authors of the *Book of Steps* (*Liber Graduum*), in the mid-fourth century, and of the *Macarian Homilies* (ca. 360–390). The first two wrote exclusively in Syriac, so it is the third who was destined to have a profound influence on the Greek-speaking, Christian

tradition. The hierarchies of Dionysius Areopagita, just over a century later, are based in great part on the linkage the Macarian homilist wishes to establish between the liturgies of heaven, earth, and the soul. The Church's worship becomes for «Macarius» the model or paradigm of the inner life, its shaping icon, given us by God in Christ in order to conform the soul to the «shape» of heaven, and enable it thus to encounter within itself the light of glory and presence of the angels. The *Homilies* effect a remarkable and powerful synthesis between the Alexandrian spiritualism of an Origen, and the Jewish-based, ascetico-mystical traditions, rooted in apocalyptic literature, which were especially prominent in the early Syrian Church. Overall, however, «Macarius» is at one with Origen's effort to focus on the «inner man» in order to discover the divine Presence within the soul. This is in turn linked at once with baptismal grace, planted by the Holy Spirit within the soul as a kind of seed, and with fidelity to the Trinitarian teaching of Nicea-Constantinople — a synthesis which makes the author of the *Homilies* one of the two most important monastic writers of the fourth century, and thereafter.

The other is Evagrius of Pontus († 399), who spent his last twelve years in the hermitages of the Cells, between Nitria and Scete in the Egyptian desert. Unlike «Macarius», who was much involved in the formation and direction of monastic communities in Roman Mesopotamia, Evagrius was a hermit, though himself continually busy with monastic correspondence. In the course of replying to questions concerning the life of solitude, and even occasionally of life in monastic community, he produced a signficant and vastly influential body of work which included *scholia* on several books of the scriptures, the treatise *On Prayer*, a trilogy of works, the *Praktikos*, *To the Monks*, and the *Gnostic Chapters*, together with over sixty extant letters. His favored mode of composition featured «centuries», groups of usually a hundred or more short sayings or aphorisms, a style adapted from biblical Wisdom literature and Cynic diatribe, and intended to be pondered slowly in the quiet of a hermitage. By means of these collections of sayings, he in fact elaborated a system, a precise map of spiritual progress, beginning with the struggle against the passions and cultivation of the virtues in order to arrive at dispassion, *apatheia*, a term of Stoic provenance which at Evagrius' hands signifies less a negative passionlessness than it does the freedom to begin to love as God loves, selflessly and without sentimentality, and so to assist in the work of divine Providence. This is the stage covered by the *Praktikos*. The second level, set out in *To the Monks*, is the knowledge of created being, seen now truly for the first time through the liberation of *apatheia* and coöperation with the saving love of God. Third and last, the subject of *On Prayer* and the *Gnostic Centuries*, is what Evagrius calls «theology», the vision of God or, in his own language, the intellect's reception as vessel and throne of the «light of the Holy Trinity». Here he employs particularly an interiorized reading of the theophany of Exodus 24. It is the sanctified intellect which is called to

become the inner «mountain of the knowledge of God», the temple and altar of the Trinity, Sinai within.

Evagrius thus sounds the exact same note of the interiorization of the journey to heaven as does the Macarian homilist, especially in the first of the latter's *Fifty Spiritual Homilies*, where, instead of Sinai, it is Ezekiel's vision of the *merkavah* or chariot throne of God which is read as a type of the Christian soul. Both men are substantially identical in the way they understand the goal of Christian life and the role of prayer and ascesis, and often recall (Evagrius most deliberately) Origen before them. Both are faithful adherents of Nicene trinitarianism, and faithful at the same time to the ancient currents of transformation going back to apocalyptic literature. Both, thirdly, represent at once in their writings and in their own persons exemplars of the ascetic holy man, the spiritual father or illumined elder, the «man of God».

The latter is a figure perhaps best known, aside from the *Life of Anthony*, in the collections of sayings coming primarily from the monastic center of Scete in fourth and fifth Egypt, the *Verba seniorum* or *Apophthegmata patrum*. The earliest of these collections is the one assembled by Evagrius himself at the end of the *Praktikos*, while the final versions, the «alphabetical» and «systematic» or «topical» collections, were edited in their present form sometime in early sixth century Palestine, perhaps at Gaza. These sayings comprise words of advice addressed to disciples and inquirers and handed down by oral tradition, brief accounts of the practices of the elders, and occasional short narratives. All are intended to edify and instruct. The basic message, if one may so summarize collections which were never intended as continuous or systematic presentations, is a stress on sobriety, manual labor, meditation on the scriptures, obedience to one's elder, and warnings directed especially against anger, judging others, and too ready a disposition to trust in one's own visions. The stress on transformation is thus muted, treated cautiously, though it is never absent. The place, Scete, appears thereafter (and even within these sayings) often as a kind of ideal, and its pattern of monastic life, rather on the basis of village life with the monks living in separate cellls or huts and gathering once a week in a central church, reappears persistently in Eastern monasticism: in the sixth century lavras of Palestine, in the Transvolgan forests of Nilus of Sora in 15th century Russia, and Optina in the 19th, in the scetes of Mt. Athos from the 16th century to the present, and in the woods of Romanian Moldavia in the 17th and 18th centuries, to cite a few notable examples. Likewise, the origins of Scete in a group of ascetics choosing to live in the vicinity of the Macarius the Egyptian (Evagrius' spiritual father), who had been the first to settle that dreadful desert in the 330's, became itself a pattern for the origin of monastic communities. This is precisely what would occur with Sabas in Palestine, Benedict in Italy, Sergius of Radonezh in 14th century Muscovy, Païssy Velichkovsky in late 18th century Moldavia, and indeed in the beginnings of several communities in the contemporary, 20th

century revival of monasticism on Mt. Athos: a sainted ascetic lives alone; disciples come to him; the elder sees the need for a common rule of life; and, more often than not, a common-life monastery, coenobium, emerges at the end of the process.

Another example of this pattern is the founder of coenobitic monasticism himself, Pachomius of Upper Egypt, in the 320's and 330's. The earlier scholarly portrait of him as a kind of ascetical drill sergeant, rigidly subordinating his monks to the exigencies of his rule, has been shown by the recent work of Phillip Rousseau and others to be quite false. He was instead an elder, *geron*, compelled by the increase of disciples wishing to live with him and under his direction to provide for them. The solution he arrived at, which later tradition ascribed to direct heavenly inspiration, was the coenobium. Yet, and this is what deserves underlining, the latter was first of all never intended to take precedence over the inner life of the monks, but was rather designed precisely to facilitate that growth while providing a certain security for the necessities of life: food, shelter, clothing, and the monks' regular «feeding» on scriptures and common worship. Secondly, the rule of Pachomius' establishments was always fundamentally the example of his own life and practice. His presence as exemplar, guide, and illumined father shines through all the works of the Pachomian Koinonia. It was, thirdly, he and, after his death, his presence as continuing in his successors which drew the recruits to his monasteries. They came, to borrow a phrase from Bishop Kallistos Ware, «less for the abbey than for the abba», in whom the presence of the risen Christ and gift of the Spirit were sought and perceived.

It is this last element which is largely missing from St. Basil's *Rules*, and yet which time and again is repeated in Eastern monasticism. Any account of the latter which credits Basil exclusively for the rule of later Byzantine establishments is therefore fundamentally incomplete. The great Cappadocian father did contribute essential elements to the later tradition of the common life in his stress on charity, community, and especially the latter as rooted in the picture of the earliest Church in the Acts of the Apostles, and these elements would reappear consistently in the later rules of Mar Saba in Palestine and the Studion in Constantinople, and thence of the Great Lavra on Mt. Athos, and subsequently of the first monasteries in Kievan Rus. But one thing he could not eliminate, if indeed it ever occurred to him to try, was the charismatic office of the inspired elder, with its ancestry in the transfigured seer of the ancient apocalypses. The latter has never disappeared from Eastern monastic spirituality, but instead has reappeared, time and again, with singular force in the creation of new foundations, or in the renewal of existing communities. To lose sight of this phenomenon is to overlook perhaps the single most fundamental thread tying together and in fact comprising the unity and continuity of Eastern spirituality.

IV. From the Fifth Century to the Present: Icons and the Jesus Prayer

By the end of the fourth century, the main lines of Eastern Christian spirituality and theology are set in the forms they possess to the present day. These include: 1) the trinitarian confession of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, 2) deification offered through the Word of God become man, 3) this pariticipation in divinity as embodied in every generation by the saints, «the men (and women) of God», 4) the interiorization of the heavenly journey and transformation of apocalyptic, and 5) the mutual reflection of the deified soul and the Church's liturgy, with both of them mirroring the liturgy of heaven, and with the earthly worship understood as mediating heaven to the «inner man», and thus as forming the latter for the inhabitation of Christ in the Spirit. The whole is marked by the continual interplay and mutual affirmation of the realms of dogmatic theology, of sacraments and liturgy, and of the ascetico-mystical tradition. All three are seen as expressions of a single whole, which is again summed up in the person of the saint who reflects and is made possible by Christ.

Likewise by the end of the fourth century, the chief expression of this spirituality, monasticism, has taken on the forms — hermit, monastic village, and coenobium — that it would use to the present. Evagrius' precisions and vocabulary, together with the rich scriptural imagery of the *Macarian Homilies*, enter permanently into and shape the self-expression of Eastern monasticism. In the centuries that follow up to the end of Byzantium in 1453, these lines continue unbroken. They are lent further expression and a certain sharpening in their lexicon by the Christological controversies of the fifth through seventh centuries, e.g., in a Maximus Confessor († 662), or in the more developed articulation between the liturgies of heaven, earth, and the soul in a Dionysius Areopagita (ca. 500), or in the stages of the Christian life in grace that one finds in John of Sinai's *Ladder of Divine Ascent* (seventh century), or in the fiery and highly personal witness to the Gospel of personal transfiguration carried on by Symeon the New Theologian († 1022), but in each case these writers are lending their particular voices to a single common stream which, as the case of Isaac of Nineveh († ca. 690) indicates, was shared across the apparent divide of formal schisms over Christology.

Two later controversies are, however, of interest as they were fought chiefly by Byzantine monks. The first was the conflict over imperial iconoclasm (730–843), and the second was the Hesychast Controversy of later Byzantium (1330's – 1340's). The icon in design, theory, and practice is again a kind of distillate expression of the three realms — dogma, liturgy, and spirituality — noted above. As the monks John of Damascus († 749) and Theodore of the Studion († 826) pointed out in their treatises in defense of the sacred images,

the icon is first of all a testimony to the truth of the Incarnation and of the change which the latter has effected in the relations between God and humanity. If in the Decalogue and especially in Dt 4:12 («You saw no form in the fire»), God is the invisible One, then, says John, in the Incarnation He has put on «the form of a servant» (Phil 2:7) and has done so permanently. He has thus become visible and therefore can be depicted. It is, adds Theodore in an echo of the vocabulary of the Christological controversies, the very Person (*hypostasis*) of the Incarnate Word whom one encounters in His icon. Not to depict Him in images, both men argue, is in fact to deny the Incarnation itself, since it is the latter which has made matter, the material creation, a vehicle of the divine presence. This is, John adds, the very basis of the Church's life in the sacraments.

The last remark highlights the second and liturgical aspect of the icon, which finds its home first and foremost in the Church's public worship, and then, as the extension of that worship, in the home, monastic cell, workshop, or wayside shrine. It serves as a constant reminder of, and window into heaven, carrying with itself, precisely as a sacramental object, the presence of the heavenly liturgy and the intercession of the saints around the throne of Christ. With the note of the saints, the «friends of God» in John of Damascus' phrase, one arrives at the third aspect of the icon: its distinctive artistic form as intended exactly to underline the note of transfiguration which is at the heart of Eastern spirituality. The lack of *chiaroscuro*, reversed perspective, elongation of the figure depicted and diminishment of its sensory organs — nose, mouth, ears — save for the eyes which are enlarged as gazing on God, together with the golden background, all come out of the spiritual tradition. The light in particular no longer falls *on* the figure from outside, but streams out *from within* it, and surrounds it. This is the light or glory of the divine presence in which the saint stands and which he or she also carries within as indwelling grace — hence the icon as depiction at once of the eschatological transformation of soul and body, and of the mystical experience available in the present life.

It was exactly over the availability of that experience, the *visio dei luminis*, that the last great debate of the Byzantine era was fought, the Hesychast controversy of the 1330's and 40's, and where monks were once again at the center of things. The claim of certain hermits on Mt. Athos that, by virtue of their constant repetition of the «Jesus prayer» («Lord Jesus Christ, have mercy on me a sinner») and of the visitation of grace, they had been vouchsafed a vision of the «uncreated light» of the Transfiguration on Mt. Tabor, led one Byzantine court theologian, Barlaam the Calabrian, to question both the monks' sanity and their orthodoxy. The reply to Barlaam on behalf of the «holy Hesychasts» was taken up by Gregory Palamas (1296–1359), whose argument constituted a kind of extended assembly and summary of the lines of tradition sketched in this essay. Palamas insisted on the reality of deifica-

tion as an immanent and not merely eschatological possibility. Likewise, the divine light he defended as rooted in the Old Testament tradition of the Glory of God and now, through the advent and gift of the Incarnate Word, as an inner presence and experience to which the entire literature of Christianity, beginning with the New Testament itself and continuing unbroken especially in the monastic tradition, bears constant witness. The Orthodox Church agreed with Gregory's analysis, and declared his teaching that of the universal Church at councils held in Constantinople in 1341, 1347, and 1351.

The «Jesus prayer» itself constitutes an example of this continuity. It is first of all rooted in the ancient theologies of God's «Name» and «Glory» originating in the Old Testament, and applied to Christ in the New (cf. Phil 2:6–11, and Jn 17). The repetition of the Name as means of access to the divine Glory is, second, witnessed to in early apocalyptic literature (e.g., *Apocalypse of Abraham* 17–18), and might conceivably lie behind St. Paul's exhortaion «to pray without ceasing» (I Thess 5:17). Third, while the breathing exercises associated with the prayer have usually been ascribed to Sufi influence, or compared with the Hindu mantra, and while it is true that explicit directions of this sort appear for the first time only in later, 13th century texts, one can find an earlier parallel for it in the exercises of Jewish *merkavah* mystics in late antiquity, and point as well to Diadochus of Photiki's fifth century recommendation to join one's breath to the name of Jesus, and to John of Sinai's similar advice in the seventh century. In short, the origins of the practice as well as of the theology of the Jesus prayer might well be sited in the same traditions of apocalyptic literature as underlie the rest of Eastern spirituality. It is in any case a fact that the cultivation of this prayer has remained a key to the practice and understanding of that spirituality to the present day. Like the icon, the Jesus prayer is itself a kind of distillate of the Eastern tradition. Everything about the latter is in a sense contained within it. This is evident in the understanding of the prayer's importance which is on prominent display in subsequent Church history, from the spread of Byzantine Hesychasm throughout the Orthodox world — e.g., to Bulgaria in Euthymius of Trnovo, to Russia in perhaps the person of Sergius of Radonezh, and certainly of Nilus of Sora — and its continued reappearance in the renewals of monastic spirituality led in the 18th century by Païssy Velichkovsky († 1794) among the Slavs and Romanians, and by Nicodemus of the Holy Mountain († 1809) among the Greeks, or in the renewals on Mt. Athos, as well as in Romania and Serbia, which are underway in those places today.

V. An Anecdote and Concluding Remarks

Some fifty years ago a sucessful young pharamcist in Cairo sold off his business, gave the proceeds to the poor, and retired to a cave in the desert. There, three books in particular informed his prayer and meditation: the scrip-

tures in Arabic translation, the Kadlubovsky-Palmer translation of *Early Fathers from the Philokalia*, and Wensinck's English rendering of Isaac of Nineveh's *Spiritual Discourses*. Young men heard of the hermit and came to live as his disciples in the neighborhood of his cave. A few years later, the group moved to the largely abandoned monastery of St. Macarius in Scete, where they continue to be the most important moving force in the contemporary renewal of Coptic monasticism.

This story of Fr. Matthew the Poor has its precise analogues in some of the accounts of the contemporary Athonite renewal, for example about the figure of Joseph the Hesychast († 1959), or the current abbot of the monastery of Simonos Petras, Fr. Aemilianos. What is peculiarly striking and illustrative of the essential unity of Eastern Christian spirituality in the story of Fr. Matthew is the fact that he, a «Monophysite» Copt, found his primary inspiration in the writings of both ancient Chalcedonian monks (the *Philokalia*), and of a seventh century, «Nestorian» saint (Isaac). None of these three great divisions of Eastern Christianity have been in communion with each other for over 1500 years, yet each — as this ancedote makes clear — continues to speak the same spiritual «language». From Murmansk to Addis Ababa, and from the Ionian islands to the Aleutians, across the gap of centuries covering huge cultural and demographical changes, Eastern Christianity remains fundamentally one in spirit, if not always consciously so. This essential unity has survived the schisms of the fifth century Christological controversies, the rise of Islam, the slaughters of Genghis Khan, Tamerlane, the last Ottomans, and of Bolshevik rule, as well as the overwhelming recent dominance of Western European culture and institutions. It is, in sum, the single most powerful witness to the thesis of this essay, which is that there are not different «schools» or «currents» of spirituality in Eastern Christianity, but rather a single great stream deriving from Christianity's origins and surviving to the present among the monks to whom Eastern believers continue to look as exemplars of their faith.

When one then turns to look at Western Christianity, the difference is unmistakable. While Western Europe (and its later extensions in the Americas) offers a history which, after the conversion of the Norsemen, presents a single, relatively smooth and increasingly triumphant growth into world dominance, in contrast to the nearly uninterrupted dislocations and catastrophes of the Christian East, the inward story is very different. From particularly the High Middle Ages, through the late Medieval to the Reformation, Counter-Reformation, Enlightenment, Romantic, Victorian, and modern periods, one finds a never ending efflorescence of different spiritualities, from the growth of the Medieval orders to the ever more manifold expressions of Protestantism. One may, of course, view this difference positively, as in the dynamism of Western Christian creativity and its lively embrace of change and progress against Eastern intellectual decrepitude and stagnation, on the one hand, or

negatively, as in Eastern fidelity to Christian origins in opposition to a West which has lost its way, on the other hand. Both approaches have certainly had their advocates. What one cannot overlook, and should not obscure with distorting projections of one's own world onto the other, as in the involuntary case of Hausherr, is the fact of this difference and its importance. Whether for purposes of simple understanding, of ecumenical rapprochement, or of preparing «deep background» for the analysis of contemporary politics and culture, there can be no genuine perception without some appreciation of this contrast.

ABSTRACT

Some seventy years ago, the late Fr. Irenée Hausherr, SJ, essayed an preliminary analysis of Eastern Christian spirituality in the first volume of the journal, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*. It proved immensely influential, especially in its assignment of Eastern Christian ascetical writers to different «schools» of spirituality — «primitive», «intellectual», «affective», «obedience», etc. Hausherr's categories continue to appear regularly in scholarly literature on the subject. This essay attempts the sketch of another approach. Rather than Hausherr's «schools» of spirituality, which in fact amount to the projection of categories familiar to that writer from Western Christian tradition onto the East, the latter's ascetical and mystical literature is best understood as a single current — as one «school», so to speak. At its heart is the notion of transformation in Christ, or *theosis*, with the latter word properly understood as the Hellenic expression of certain fundamental themes, centered on the *visio dei* and consequent transformation, inherited from Christianity's original matrix in Second Temple Judaism. The article briefly traces this continuum, beginning with apocalyptic literature and proceeding to the New Testament era, pre-Nicene Christian writers, the early monks, the iconclast controversy, and concluding with the Byzantine Hesychasts.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ВВ	—	*Византийский временник*
ИОРЯС	—	*Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук*
СОРЯС	—	*Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук*
ХВ	—	*Христианский Восток*
ЧОИДР	—	*Чтения в Обществе истории и древностей российских*
AAWG.PH	—	Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft des Wissenschaften Göttingen — Philologisch-historische Klasse
AB	—	Anchor Bible
ABD	—	Anchor Bible Dictionary / Ed. D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. (New York, 1992)
AfO	—	*Archiv für Orientforschung*
AGAJU AGJU	—	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AHDL	—	Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age
ALUOS	—	Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society
ANET	—	Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament / Ed. J. B. Pritchard (Princeton, 1969[3])
ANF	—	Ante-Nicene Fathers. 8 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI, 1967)
AnSt	—	*Anatolian Studies*
AOAT	—	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AOS	—	American Oriental Series
APOT	—	The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 vols. / Ed. R. H. Charles (Oxford, 1913).
ARAB	—	Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia / Ed. Daniel David Luckenbill. 2 vols. (Chicago, 1926–1927)
ArOr	—	*Archiv Orientální*
ASTI	—	*Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute*
ATh	—	*L'année théologique*
BETL	—	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
Bib	—	*Biblica*
BJRL	—	*Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*
BJS	—	Brown Judaic Studies
BJSUC	—	Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California
BN	—	*Biblische Notizen*
BSJS	—	Brill's Series in Jewish Studies
BTB	—	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*

BZNW	—	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	—	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	—	The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CEJL	—	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
ChH	—	*Church History*
ConBOT	—	Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series
COr	—	*Cahiers d'Orientalisme*
CRINT	—	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CSCO	—	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CSEL	—	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
CSHB	—	Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae
DJD	—	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSD	—	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
DSp	—	Dictionnaire de Spiritualité
EstBib	—	*Estudios Biblicos*
EJ	—	Encyclopaedia Judaica. 16 vols. (Jerusalem—New York, 1971–1972)
EJL	—	Early Judaism and Its Literature
EJM	—	Études sur le judaisme medieval
EL	—	*Ephemerides Liturgicae*
ETL	—	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*
ETR	—	*Etudes théologiques et religieuses*
ETS	—	Erfurter Theologische Studien
ExpTimes	—	*Expository Times*
FJB	—	*Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge*
GOTR	—	*Greek Orthodox Theological Review*
HJ	—	*Historisches Jahrbuch*
HSM	—	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	—	Harvard Semitic Studies
HTR	—	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	—	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IEJ	—	*Israel Exploration Journal*
IKZ	—	*Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift*
Int	—	*Interpretation*
IPQ	—	*International Philosophical Quarterly*
ITQ	—	*Irish Theological Quarterly*
JANES	—	*Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University*
JAOS	—	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	—	*Journal of Biblical Literature*

JCS	—	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies*
JECS	—	*Journal of Early Christian Studies*
JJS	—	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JÖB	—	*Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*
JQR	—	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JRS	—	*Journal of Roman Studies*
JSHRZ	—	Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit
JSJ	—	*Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JSNT	—	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSS	—	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOTSup	—	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSP	—	*Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*
JSQ	—	*Jewish Studies Quarterly*
JSPSup JSPSS	—	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
JTS	—	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LCL	—	Loeb Classical Library
LuthQ	—	*Lutheran Quarterly*
Mus	—	*Le Muséon: Revue d'études orientales*
MUSJ	—	Mélanges de L'Université Saint-Joseph
NHS	—	Nag Hammadi Studies
NMS	—	Nottingham Medieval Studies
NovTSup	—	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NPNF	—	Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers
NT	—	*Novum Testamentum*
NTOA	—	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
NTS	—	*New Testament Studies*
OBO	—	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OC	—	*Oriens Christianus*
OCA	—	Orientalia Christiana Analecta
OCP	—	*Orientalia Christiana Periodica*
OrSyr	—	*L'Orient syrien*
OTP	—	The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha / Ed. J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols (New York, 1983–1985)
OTS	—	*Old Testament Studies*
ParOr	—	*Parole de l'Orient*
PG	—	Patrologia graeca [= Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca] / Acc. J. P. Migne (Parisiis, 1857–1866)
Ph	—	*Revue de philologie de litérature et d'histoire anciennes*
PL	—	Patrologia latina [= Patrologiae cursus completus: Series latina] / Acc. J. P. Migne (Parisiis, 1844–1864)

PO	—	Patrologia Orientalis
PS	—	Patrologia Syriaca. I, II, III (Parisii, 1884, 1907, 1926)
PSB	—	*Princeton Seminary Bulletin*
PTA	—	Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen
PVTG	—	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece
RB	—	*Revue Biblique*
RdQ	—	*Revue de Qumran*
REAug	—	*Revue des études augustiniennes*
REG	—	*Revue des études grecques*
RevExp	—	*Review and Expositor*
RevQ	—	*Revue de Qumran*
RHPhR	—	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*
RHR	—	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*
ROC	—	*Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*
RSLR	—	*Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa*
RSR	—	*Recherches de science religieuse*
RThom	—	*Revue thomiste*
SBLPS	—	Society of Biblical Literature Pseudepigrapha Series
SBLSP	—	*Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers*
SBLDS	—	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLEJL	—	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
SBLSBS	—	Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study
SBLSCS	—	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBS	—	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SC	—	Sources Chrétiennes
SCS	—	Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series
SE	—	*Studia Evangelica*
Sem	—	*Semitica*
SHR	—	Studies in the History of Religions (supplement to *Numen*)
SIDA	—	Scripta Instituti Donneriani Aboensis
SJ	—	Studia judaica
SJLA	—	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SJOT	—	*Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*
SJSJ	—	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
SJT	—	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
SNT	—	Studien zum Neuen Testament
SNTSMS	—	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
Sob/ECR	—	*Sobornost (incorporating Eastern Churches Review)*
SP	—	*Studia Patristica*
STDJ	—	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

StMon	—	*Studia Monastica*
StSem	—	*Studi Semitici*
SVC	—	Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae
SVTQ	—	*St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*
SVTP	—	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigraphica
TBN	—	Themes in Biblical Narrative
TDNT	—	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 10 vols / Transl. and ed. G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, 1964–1976)
TDOT	—	Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament / Ed. G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren. Transl. J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley, D. Green. 10 vols (Grand Rapids, 1974)
TED	—	Translations of Early Documents
TEG	—	Traditio Exegetica Graeca
Theol	—	*Theologica*
ThStK	—	*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*
TPQ	—	*Theologisch-Praktische Quartalschrift*
TS	—	*Theological Studies*
TSAJ	—	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
TTPS	—	Texts and Translations. Pseudepigrapha Series
TU	—	Texte und Untersuchungen
TWAT	—	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament / Ed. G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren (Stuttgart, 1970–)
TZ	—	*Theologische Zeitschrift*
UBL	—	Ugaritisch-Biblische Literatur
UF	—	*Ugarit-Forschungen*
VC	—	*Vigiliae christianae*
VT	—	*Vetus Testamentum*
WBC	—	World Bible Commentary
WMANT	—	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	—	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	—	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZKT	—	*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*
ZNW	—	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*
ZWT	—	*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*

LOCATIONS OF THE ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS

Bogdan G. Bucur, The Angelomorphic Spirit in Early Christianity: Revelation, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, Clement of Alexandria (unpublished).

Silviu N. Bunta, Too Vast to Fit in the World: Moses, Adam, and צל ם אל הים in the *Testament of Moses* 11:8 // *Henoch* 26 (2004) 188–204.

Silviu N. Bunta, The *Mēsu*-tree and the Animal Inside: Theomorphism and Theriomorphism in Daniel 4 (unpublished).

Dragoş A. Giulea, Seeking to See Him at the Festival of Pascha: Glory-Soteriology in Early Christian Paschal Materials and Rabbinic Literature (unpublished).

Alexander Golitzin, Christian Mysticism *Over* Two Millenia [under the title: Spirituality: Eastern Christian // The Encyclopedia of Monasticism / Ed. W. M. Johnston (Chicago—London, 2001) Vol. 2. 1185–1193.

Alexander Golitzin, «The Demons Suggest an Illusion of God's Glory in a Form»: Controversy over the Divine Body and Vision of Glory in Some Late Fourth-, Early Fifth-Century Monastic Literature // *Studia Monastica* 44.1 (2002) 13–43.

Alexander Golitzin, Dionysius Areopagites in the Works of St. Gregory Palamas: On the Question of a «Christological Corrective» and Related Matters // *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 46.2–3 (2002) 164–190.

Alexander Golitzin, The Body of Christ: St. Symeon the New Theologian on Spiritual Life and the Hierarchical Church (Il Corpo di Christo: Simeone il nuovo teologo sulla vita spirituale e la chiesa Gerarchia) // Simeone il Nuovo Teologo e il Monachismo in Constantinopoli: Atti del X Convegno Ecumenico Internazionale di Spiritualita ortodossa, sezione bizantina. Bose, 15–17 settembre, 2002 / Eds. Sabino Chiala e Lisa Cremaschi (Bose, Edizione Qiqajon, 2003) 255–288.

Alexander Golitzin, Dionysius Areopagites: A Christian Mysticism? // *Pro Ecclesia* 12.2 (2003) 1–52.

Alexander Golitzin, The Image and Glory of God in Jacob of Serug's Homily: «On the Chariot that Ezekiel the Prophet Saw» // *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 46.2–3 (2003) 323–364.

Andrei A. Orlov, Titles of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch // *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18 (1998) 71–86.

Andrei A. Orlov, Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition // *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 39 (Atlanta, 2000) 130–147.

Andrei A. Orlov, The Origin of the Name 'Metatron' and the Text of 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 21 (2000) 19–26.

Andrei A. Orlov, Secrets of Creation in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch // *Henoch* 22.1 (2000) 45–62.

Andrei A. Orlov, Alexander Golitzin, «Many Lamps Are Lightened from the One»: Paradigms of the Transformational Vision in the Macarian Homilies // *Vigiliae Christianae* 55 (2001) 281–298.

Andrei A. Orlov, Overshadowed by Enoch's Greatness: «Two Tablets» Traditions from the *Book of Giants* to *Palaea Historica* // *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 32 (2001) 137–158.

Andrei A. Orlov, The Flooded Arboretums: The Garden Traditions in the Slavonic Version of *3 Baruch* and the *Book of Giants* // *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 65 (2003) 184–201.

Andrei A. Orlov, On the Polemical Nature of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*: A Reply to C. Böttrich // *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 34 (2003) 274–303.

Andrei A. Orlov, Celestial Choirmaster: The Liturgical Role of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch* and the Merkabah Tradition // *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 14.1 (2004) 3–24.

Andrei A. Orlov, The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob* // Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture / Ed. C. A. Evans (London, 2004) (Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity, 9) Vol. 2. 59–76.

Andrei A. Orlov, Noah's Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noachic Polemics and the Date of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch // *Henoch* 26.2 (2004) 172–187.

Andrei A. Orlov, «Without Measure and Without Analogy»: The Tradition of the Divine Body in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* // *Journal of Jewish Studies* 56.2 (2005) 224–244.

Andrei A. Orlov, The Heirs of the Enochic Lore: «Men of Faith» in *2 Enoch* 35:2 and *Sefer Hekhalot* 48D:10 (unpublished).

Andrei A. Orlov, Resurrection of Adam's Body: The Redeeming Role of Enoch-Metatron in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* (unpublished).

Part One: Christian Texts

Bogdan G. Bucur
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

THE ANGELOMORPHIC SPIRIT IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY: REVELATION, THE *SHEPHERD OF HERMAS*, CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA[1]

The title of this essay is a deliberate allusion to John R. Levison's seminal article entitled «The Angelic Spirit in Early Judaism», which documented the widespread use, in pre- and post-exilic Judaism, of the term «spirit» as a designation of angelic presence. In the conclusion of his article, Levison formulated the following challenge to the scholarly community:

> Discussions of the spirit of God in Early Judaism and Christianity ... ought to consider ... interpretations of the spirit as an angelic presence. ... The texts included in the present analysis serve ... to provide a suitable foundation for discussion of the angelic spirit in the Fourth Gospel, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Ascension of Isaiah.[2]

The following pages are an attempt to take up the challenge, and pursue the occurrence of the «angelic spirit» (which I will henceforth refer to as «angelomorphic Pneumatology») in early Christian literature.[3] In the first section of this essay, I will argue that angelomorphic Pneumatology figures prominently in the book of Revelation, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, and the Jewish Christian theology echoed by Clement of Alexandria's *Eclogae Propheticae*, *Adumbrationes*, and *Excerpta ex Theodoto*.

---

[1] This essay is part of a larger project dedicated to angelomorphic Pneumatology in the first four centuries. The sections on Clement of Alexandria and the *Shepherd of Hermas* are treated separately, but in greater detail, in my forthcoming articles: Revisiting Christian Oeyen: «The Other Clement» on Father, Son, and the Angelomorphic Spirit // *VC* 61 (2007); The Son of God and the Angelomorphic Holy Spirit: A Rereading of the *Shepherd's* Theology // *ZNW* 98 (2007) 1–23. For the initial impulse towards this area of research I am indebted to Dr. Michel René Barnes, my professor at Marquette University. I have learned from him, directly, just as much as I have indirectly, by arguing against some of his opinions. For a comprehensive presentation of early Christian doctrines of the Holy Spirit, the reader is referred to Dr. Barnes' soon-to-be-published book on Pneumatology.

[2] J. Levison, The Angelic Spirit in Early Judaism // *SBLSP* 34 (1995) 464–493 (here 493; 492). See also his Spirit in First Century Judaism (Leiden, 1997) (AGJU, 29).

[3] For a survey of Jewish and early Christian materials that instantiate «angelomorphic Pneumatology», see Ch. Gieschen, Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence (Leiden, 1998) (AGJU 42) 114–119.

The relation between angelomorphic Pneumatology and other occurrences in early Christian thought, such as angelomorphic Christology, Spirit Christology, or binitarianism, has not received adequate attention. How, for instance, does the *Shepherd*'s oft-discussed Spirit Christology relate to the «angelic Spirit»? My thesis, for which the second part of the essay will accumulate evidence, is that the angelomorphic Pneumatology detected in Revelation, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, and Clement of Alexandria, always occurs within a binitarian theological framework, and in tandem with Spirit Christology. This larger theological articulation results in a quasi-Trinitarian structure of the divine world, featuring the Father, the Son/Spirit, and the angelomorphic Spirit.

The third and final section of the essay will sketch out a theological interpretation of these data. I submit that the concurrence of angelomorphic Pneumatology, Spirit Christology and binitarianism gives expression to a Trinitarian experience of God, articulated in the largely Jewish Christian idiom of early Christianity.[4]

I. Angelomorphic Pneumatology in Early Christianity

The terms «angelomorphic» and «angelomorphism» require some clarification. According to Crispin Fletcher-Louis, these terms are to be used «wherever there are signs that an individual or community possesses specifically angelic characteristics or status, though for whom identity cannot be reduced to that of an angel».[5] The virtue of this definition — and the reason for my substituting the term «angelomorphic Pneumatology» for Levison's «angelic Spirit» – is that it signals the use of angelic *characteristics* in descriptions of God or humans, while not necessarily implying that the latter are angels *stricto sensu:* neither «angelomorphic Christology» nor «angelomorphic Pneumatology» imply the identification of Christ or the Holy Spirit with «angels».[6]

[4] Throughout this essay, the term «Jewish Christian» will be taken in the sense described by J. Daniélou in his classic work: The Theology of Jewish Christianity (London, 1964). As long as the narrative of an early and radical parting of the ways between «Christianity» and «Judaism» remains normative, despite its inability to explain a great deal of textual evidence from the first four centuries, the term «Jewish Christianity» remains useful as a description of «Christianity» itself. For more recent treatments of this problem, see the essays collected in A. H. Becker, A. Y. Reed (eds.), The Ways that Never Parted (Tübingen, 2003) (TSAJ, 95); D. Boyarin, Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity (Philadelphia, Pa., 2004).

[5] C. Fletcher-Louis, Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology (Tübingen, 1997) (WUNT, 2/94) 14–15.

[6] It is important to caution against an anachronistic understanding of the terms «angel» or «spirit». According to Daniélou (*Jewish Christianity*, 118), «the use of such terms in no way implies that Christ was by nature an angel. …The word angel… connotes a supernatural being manifesting itself. The nature of this supernatural be-

In the words of Tertullian (*De carne Christi* 14), «dictus est quidem (Christus) magni consilii angelus, id est nuntius, *oficii, non naturae vocabulo*».

1. The Angelomorphic Spirit in the Book of Revelation

Revelation knows of a mysterious group of «seven spirits», mentioned repeatedly in Rev 1:4, 3:1, 4:5, and 5:6. The first of these references, which occurs in the opening blessing (Rev 1:4–5) is notoriously difficult to understand. Patristic exegesis as well as modern-day commentators have outlined the following alternatives:

(a) Revelation connects the seven spirits / eyes / lamps of the Lord (Zech 3:9, 4:10) with the rest/ tabernacling of the seven spiritual gifts (Isa 11:2, Prov 8:12–16);[7]

(b) Revelation connects the seven spirits / eyes / lamps of the Lord (Zech 3:9, 4:10) with the seven angels of the presence (Tob 12:15; 1 Enoch 90: 20–21).[8]

The exegetical impasse is evident. Patristic authors from the fifth century onwards are overcautious, given the potentially dangerous character of the passage.[9] Modern exegetes tend to juxtapose the two solutions, rarely daring to eliminate either possibility.[10]

The angelic traits of these «spirits» are undeniable. They are depicted as standing before the divine throne (Rev 1:4; 4:1), subject to Christ (Rev 3:1),

---

ing is not determined by the expression but by the context. "Angel" is the old-fashioned equivalent of "person"». See also Ph. Henne, La Christologie chez Clément de Rome et dans le Pasteur d'Hermas (Fribourg, 1992) 225.

[7] This position is held by the vast majority of scholars, patristic and modern. The connection between Isa 11:2 (the seven gifts of the Spirit) and Zech 4:10 (the seven lamps) is an established *topos* in patristic exegesis. See K. Schlütz, *Isaias 11:2* in den ersten vier christlichen Jahrhunderten (Münster, 1932) 34.

[8] This position is defended by J. Michl (Die Engelvorstellungen in der Apokalypse des hl. Johannes (Munich, 1937) and D. E. Aune (Revelation. 3 vols. (Dallas, Tex., 1997) (WBC 52) Vol. 1. 33–35). It should be noted that the impressive arsenal of primary and secondary literature deployed by these authors recommends this minority opinion as worthy of the same consideration as the majority position.

[9] I rely here on the fragments from patristic commentaries collected by H. B. Swete (The Apocalypse of St. John: the Greek text with introduction, notes and indices (Grand Rapids, 1909) 5–6) and Michl (Die Engelvorstellungen… 113–134).

[10] Schweitzer simply juxtaposes the religio-historical perspective («from the point of view of the history of religion, they are simply the seven archangels»), and the traditional theological point of view, according to which the seven spirits «represent the Spirit of God in its fullness and completeness». E. Schweitzer, Spirit of God (Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*) (London, 1960) 105–106. Aune is exhaustive in his references, but very reserved in advocating the identification between the seven spirits and the principal angels (Aune, Revelation… 34).

so as to be sent out throughout the world (Rev 5:6). Needless to say, these are standard elements in the depiction of angelic intercession, contemplation and service. In fact, Revelation also knows of «the seven *angels* before the throne» (Rev 8:2). Since both «angels» and «spirits» are well-defined groups (*the* seven spirits, *the* seven angels), it is most likely that they refer to the same reality.[11]

Here we find a definite echo of the Jewish and Jewish-Christian traditions about the highest angelic company.[12]

The use of πνεῦμα language to designate angelic beings does not surprise. Far from being a Christian invention, much less a peculiarity of Revelation, this phenomenon is present in the Hebrew Bible, the LXX and various authors of the Alexandrian diaspora, and at Qumran.[13] In Isa 63:9–10 the Angel of the Lord is referred to as «holy spirit». In the New Testament, it is usually *evil* angels that are referred to as (impure) «spirits», but one also finds references to angelic beings in general.[14] In the Book of Revelation, πνεῦμα is used twice for angelic beings, namely evil ones (Rev 16:13–14; 18:2). But

[11] Aune, Revelation… Vol. 1. 33. P. Prigent (Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John (Tübingen, 2001) 117), points to Rev 3:1 («…these things says He who has the seven spirits of God and the seven stars…») as proof that the seven spirits are different from the seven stars, identified in Rev 1:20 with the seven angels. However, it makes perfect sense to understand καί as epexegetical.

[12] The group of seven is found in Ezekiel 9:2–3 (seven angelic beings, of which the seventh is more important than the other six), Tob 12:15 (seven «holy angels» who have access before the Glory, where they present the prayers of «the saints»), and 1 Enoch (ch. 20: seven archangels; ch. 90:21, «the seven first snow-white ones»). The notion of «first created» is important to the author of *Jubilees*: the angels of the presence are said to be circumcised from their creation on the second day, thus possessing a certain perfection and functioning as heavenly models and final destination of the people of Israel (*Jub* 2:2; 15:27). The *Prayer of Joseph* seems to imply that Israel ranks higher than the seven archangels, as chief captain and first minister before the face of God. For a list of references to «angel / angels of the face» in the Pseudepigrapha, see C. L. Seow, Face // Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible / Ed. K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, P. W. van der Horst (Leiden—Boston—Grand Rapids, 1999) 322–325. Relevant passages are Jub 2:2, 18; 15:27; 31:14; T. Levi 3:5; 4:2; T. Judah 25:2; 1 QH 6:13. In 2 En 19:1, a group of seven angels is placed in the sixth heaven. See also J. C. VanderKam, The Book of Jubilees (Sheffield, 2001) 87–89, 126–127; Gieschen, Angelomorphic Christology… 124–151.

[13] Levison, The Angelic Spirit…, passim; A. E. Sekki, The Meaning of Ruach at Qumran (Atlanta, Ga, 1989) (SBLDS, 110) 145–171.

[14] Aside from the designation of *evil* angels as (impure) «spirits», the equivalence of «spirit» and «angel» is implicit in Heb 1:14 (angels are «ministering spirits»), Heb 12:9 («Father of spirits»), and Acts 8:26.29.39, where the text seems to alternate between «angel of the Lord», «spirit», and, «spirit of the Lord».

as the parallel between Rev 14:13 and Rev 19:9 reveals, πνεῦμα can also indicate a good angel.[15]

On the other hand, the Pneumatological content of Rev. 1:4 is equally clear. The seven «first created spirits» are one of the three coordinated entities (God *and* the seven spirits *and* Jesus Christ) invoked as senders of grace and peace. Since the blessing with «grace and peace» can only be divine,[16] the three must, in some way, stand for the divinity (cf. 2 Cor 13:14, *The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all*).[17] This is why it seems most likely that the mentioning of the «seven spirits» corresponds to the expected reference to the Holy Spirit. In other words, the author's expression «seven spirits» would designate what the early Church more often referred to as «Holy Spirit». The greeting in Revelation is therefore Trinitarian. It is a «grotesque» Trinity, or one that is «quite orthodox», depending whether or not one chooses to consider it in its proper context, which is that of Jewish apocalyptic traditions appropriated by early Christians.[18]

---

[15] Rev 14:13: «And I heard **a voice from heaven saying**, "Write this: *Blessed are the dead who from now on die in the Lord!*" "Yes", **says the Spirit** (the initial locutor, the voice), "they will rest from their labors, for their deeds follow them"»; Rev 19:9: «And **the angel** said to me, "Write this: *Blessed are those invited to the marriage supper of the Lamb!*" And **said he** (the initial locutor, the angel) to me, "These are true words of God!"» From a form-critical perspective, both passages are examples of the so-called promise-to-the-victor, a type of statement that occurs fairly often in the Book of Revelation. In both passages, an initial declaration is repeated and confirmed by the same heavenly locutor. The difference consists only in the fact that we read «spirit» in Rev 14:13, and, respectively, «angel» in Rev 19:9. Yet, in light of the structural similarities in structure and content, and given the interchangeability of the terms «angel» and «spirit» in early Jewish and Christian texts, I believe that the case under discussion is another example of πνεῦμα language in the service of angelology.

[16] *Pace* Michl (Die Engelvorstellungen… 155–156). Michl tries to escape the difficulty by interpreting the blessing with «grace and peace» coming from the angels as «eine Spendung im uneigentlichen Sinne» (156). On the other hand, he adduces a number of Jewish and Christian texts in which angels appear to hold a certain exalted status in their relations with humans. The difficulty of Rev 1:4, however, is due to the fact that angels appear to be placed on the same level with the Father and the Son!

[17] See also the list of passages illustrating Paul's «soteriological trinitarianism» in G. Fee, Christology and Pneumatology in Romans 8:9–11 and Elsewhere: Some Reflections on Paul as a Trinitarian // Jesus of Nazareth Lord and Christ: Essays in the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology / Ed. M. Turner, J. B. Greene (Grand Rapids, 1994) 312–331, here 329–330.

[18] These are the terms used by R. H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John (Edinburgh, 1920) iv; and G. Dix, The Seven Archangels and the Seven Spirits: A Study in the Origin, Development, and Messianic Associations of the Two Themes // *JTS* 28 (1927) 233–250, here 248.

2. The Angelomorphic Spirit in the *Shepherd of Hermas*[19]

Very similar to the seven spirits / angels of Revelation are the seven «first created» beings (πρωτόκτιστοι) in Clement of Alexandria, which will be discussed later in this essay. Before Clement, and certainly one of his sources, the *Shepherd of Hermas* knows of a group of seven consisting of the six angel «first created» (πρῶτοι κτισθέντες) who accompany the Son of God as their seventh (Vis 3:4:1; Sim 5:5:3).[20] They hold the highest position in a world of angelic spirits. But the *Shepherd* contains several passages that support the case for angelomorphic Pneumatology.

(a) Mand 11 discusses at length the action of the inspiring agent upon the Christian prophet, the complex relationship between the prophet and his audience, and the distinction between true and false prophets. Up to Mand 11.9, the text uses only «spirit» language, giving advice about how to discriminate between the divine spirit and the earthly spirit, and describing their respective activities in the authentic and, respectively, the false prophet. Then, in Mand 11.9, the text uses «angel» for the very same reality that it had described as an indwelling «spirit».[21] As for the «angel of the prophetic spirit»,

---

[19] Greek text in M. Leutzsch, Papiasfragmente. Hirt des Hermas (Darmstadt, 1998). In submitting to the current scholarly consensus, I assume that the *Shepherd of Hermas* is a unitary text, dating from the early decades of the second century. See the firm conclusions of R. Joly, Hermas et le Pasteur // *VC* 21 (1967) 201–218, echoed in the most recent commentaries on the Shepherd: N. Brox, Der Hirt des Hermas (Göttingen, 1991) (KAV, 7); C. Osiek, Shepherd of Hermas (Minneapolis, Minn., 1999) (Hermeneia). While the scholarly consensus seems to have settled around the year 140, with a tendency towards the earlier part of the second century (Brox, Der Hirt… 22–25), Osiek (Shepherd Commentary… 20b) concludes on «an expanded duration of time beginning perhaps from the very last years of the first century, but stretching through most of the first half of the second century». Leutzsch proposes the interval 90–130.

[20] By referring almost in the same breath to the Son and the first-created angels (Sim 5.2.6, 11; Sim 5.6.4, 7), the *Shepherd* suggests that, even though they are clearly subordinated to the Son of God, and accompany him as a celestial escort (e.g., Sim 9.12.7–8; cf. Vis 3:4:1; Sim 5:5:3), the πρῶτοι κτισθέντες are his «friends» and fellow-counselors (Sim 5.5.2–3). As noted by Daniélou (Jewish Christianity… 38), «the Word appears as the chief of the six archangels, being himself the seventh».

[21] «So when the person who has the spirit of God enter the assembly of just men …then the angel of the prophetic spirit that rests upon that person (ὁ κείμενος ἐπ' αὐτῷ) fills the person, who, being filled with the holy spirit speaks to the whole crowd as the Lord wishes» (Mand 11.9). The phrase ὁ κείμενος ἐπ' αὐτῷ has been translated in various other ways: «qui est près de lui» (Joly); «in charge of him» (Reiling, Gieschen); «der bei ihm ist» (Brox). See the very helpful survey and discussion in J. Chr. Wilson, Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas: Its Date and Pneumatology (Lewiston—Queenston—Lampeter, 1993) 97.

a fruitful comparison can be made with «the angel of the Holy Spirit» in the *Ascension of Isaiah*, and, by analogy with the «angel of penitence» in Vis 5.7, with «the angel presiding over genuine visions» in *2 Bar.* and *3 Bar.*[22] Interestingly, in all cases the reference is to an angelic being (*Ascension of Isaiah* identifies the «angel of the Lord» in Mat 1:20.24 with the angel of the Holy Spirit, 9:36 and 11:4; Ramiel in *2 Bar.*; Phamael in *3 Bar.*). This expression may, therefore, be included in Levison's category «angelic spirit».[23]

(b) In Sim 9.13.2, the virgins are termed «holy spirits», ἅγια πνεύματα, and «powers of the Son of God», δυνάμεις τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ (Sim 9.13.2). To be clothed with these «powers» means to bear the «power» of the Son of God (Sim 9.13.2). In other words, the Son of God is active in the believer through these «powers» or «spirits».[24] The deployment of clothing and baptismal language suggests that the virgins can be seen as a plural designation of the Holy Spirit. In describing the eschatological state of those who have the Spirit, the *Shepherd* uses the following expressions: «always clothed with the holy spirit of these young women» (Sim 9.24.2); «you have received something of his [the Lord's] spirit» (Sim 9.24.4); «they received the Holy Spirit» (Sim 9.25.2). Believers must «clothe themselves with these spirits» (Sim 9.13.2), as a result becoming «one body, *one spirit*, and one color of garment» (Sim 9.13.5). The white color of the garment finds a symbolic counterpart in the white color of the tower: «So stones of many different colors were brought… And when the variegated stones were put into the building, all alike became white and changed their many colors» (Sim 9.4.5–6). The tower built on water, the white garment, the transformation into «one spirit» obviously refer to Baptism and the receiving of the Holy Spirit. Indeed, the *Shepherd of Hermas* collapses the spirits and the Spirit in his exhortation to repentance and holiness: «give back the spirit (*reddite spiritum,* L1) as whole as you have received it! …what do you think the Lord will do to you, who gave you the spirit (*spiritum dedit*) whole, but you gave it back useless?»

[22] *Ascension of Isaiah* 7:23, 8:12, 9:36.39.40, 11:4; *2 Bar.* 55:3; 3Bar 11:7. J. Reiling (Hermas and Christian Prophecy: A Study of the Eleventh Mandate (Leiden, 1973) (NovTSup, 37) 106) rejects this equation arguing that the *Shepherd* does not mention an angel «of prophecy», but rather «of the prophetic spirit».

[23] Gieschen (Angelomorphic Christology… 218) notes that «this angel is much more than another angel with a specific function», and that he is «closely linked with "the Spirit"». Gieschen identifies the «angel of the prophetic spirit» as an angelomorphic manifestation of the Holy Spirit.

[24] Cf. Levison (The Angelic Spirit… 469), who argues that the metaphor of clothing in Judg 6:34 «is consistent with the interpretation of the spirit as an angelic or demonic being». For the use of «power», see the brief but very dense overview, see Gieschen, Angelomorphic Christology… 119–123 («Power as designation for an Angel»). Among the relevant passages: Philo, *Conf* 168–182, Rom 8:38, 1 Cor 15:24, Eph 1:21; 1 Pet 3:22.

(Sim 9.32.2, 4).[25] Being «clothed with these spirits» (Sim 9.13.2), which are the «powers» of the Son, means, then, to receive the white garment of Baptism.[26] I conclude, in agreement with Wilson, that «the term [ἅγια πνεύματα] does signify a plural concept of the Holy Spirit».[27]

(c) There exists a structural similarity between Mand 5 and Mand 6: both make certain statements of spiritual and psychological dualism, continue with a rather detailed symptomatology and prognosis for each alternative, and conclude with an exhortation to choose the good. At the level of vocabulary, however, Mand 5 uses «spirit», while Mand 6 has «angel».[28] The parallelism is particularly notable between «the spirit of righteousness» in Mand 5.2.7, and «the angel of righteousness» in several verses of Mand 6.2. Moreover, «delicate» (τρυφερός), «meek» / «meekness» (πραός / πραότης), and «tranquil» / «tranquility» (ἡσύχιος / ἡσυχία) are used of both the angel (Mand 6.2.3) and the «spirit» (Mand 5.2.6).[29]

So far, it appears that the «spirits» have undeniable angelic traits. It is just as true, however, that the angel of righteousness in Mand 6 conveys a pneumatological content. In this respect, I have already mentioned the «delicacy» of the Holy Spirit. Another crucial indicator are the terms ἡσύχιος and ἡσυχία, whose quasi-technical status in describing the abiding presence of the

[25] Leutzsch prefers to include L2 in the text: *habebitis spiritum*, «you shall have the spirit». However, L1 makes better sense in connection with Sim 9.32.4.

[26] Irenaeus equates the divine garment with the Holy Spirit (*Adv. haer.* 3:23:5; 4:36:6). The *Shepherd*'s affirmation that «one cannot be found in the reign of God unless they [the virgins] clothe you with their garments» (Sim 9.13.2) finds perfect counterpart in Irenaeus' theology of the paradisiac, baptismal, and eschatological garment, equated with the gift of the Holy Spirit. See Y. de Andia, Homo Vivens: Incorruptibilité et divinisation de l'homme chez Irénée de Lyon (Paris, 1986) 97–99.

[27] Wilson, Reassessment… 154, n. 129.

[28] Each person is attended by two spirits (Mand 5.1.4) or angels (Mand 6.2.1). The criterion for distinguishing the influence of the good angel or spirit from that of the evil one is the experience and subsequent conduct of the indwelled person (Mand 5.2.1–3; Mand 6.2.3–4). One is to trust the good spirit (Mand 11.17, 21) or angel (Mand 6.2.3), and depart from the evil spirit or angel (Mand 6.2.7; Mand 5.2; Mand 11.17).

[29] The theme of the Spirit's «delicacy» seems to have been taken over by none other than Tertullian, otherwise a harsh critic of the *Shepherd*. See J. E. Morgan-Wynne, The «Delicacy» of the Spirit in the Shepherd of Hermas and in Tertullian // *SP* 21 (1989) 154–157. H. Opitz (Ursprünge Frühkatholischer Pneumatologie (Berlin 1960) 140–141) traces the «delicacy of the Spirit» to Jewish-Christian exegesis of 1 Sam 16:14–15 (LXX). The fact that the *Shepherd of Hermas* is aware of an old tradition of dualist pneumatology rooted in the exegesis of 1 Sam 16:14 has been proven by recourse to similar passages in Aphrahat. See N. Ibrahim Fredrikson, L'Esprit Saint et les esprits mauvais dans le pasteur d'Hermas: Sources et prolongements // *VC* 55 (2001) 262–280, esp. 273–275.

Holy Spirit has been demonstrated by Gabriele Winkler.[30] It appears, therefore, that the *Shepherd* retains the use of «spirit» language for angelic beings, but also deploys «angel» language and imagery to speak about the Holy Spirit. In short, we find in the *Shepherd* both «spirit» angelology and angelomorphic Pneumatology.

It is also important to consider the *Shepherd*'s πρῶτοι κτισθέντες in religio-historical perspective. There can be no question that this collective character is an echo of angelological speculations common in Second Temple Judaism. Such traditions about the highest angelic company underwent considerable modifications under the influence of the early Christian kerygma. One example would be the subordination of the supreme angels to the Son of God, a subordination that is quite obvious in the *Shepherd* and Revelation. A second change in the status of the seven angels consists in their overlap with the Holy Spirit. I have already mentioned this phenomenon in Revelation. A case has been made for the close association (bordering on identification) between the seven spirits and the Holy Spirit in the writings of Justin Martyr.[31] But the most significant witness is that of Clement of Alexandria.

3. The Angelomorphic Spirit in Clement of Alexandria

Clement of Alexandria is one of our most eminent witnesses of secret traditions ascribed to the apostles and circulating among Jewish Christian teachers during the first three centuries of the common era.[32] It is especially in the much neglected *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, *Eclogae Propheticae*, and *Adumbrationes* that he is echoing the theology and practices of earlier Jewish Christian teachers. These are remnants from Clement's otherwise lost *Hypotyposeis*, a work for advanced students, where the Alexandrian also treated of the Holy Spirit, the soul, and prophecy.[33]

---

[30] For ample documentation and a very detailed analysis, see G. Winkler, Ein bedeutsamer Zusammenhang zwischen der Erkenntnis und Ruhe in Mt 11, 27–29 und dem Ruhen des Geistes auf Jesus am Jordan. Eine Analyse zur Geist-Christologie in Syrischen und Armenischen Quellen // *Mus* 96 (1983) 267–326.

[31] Ch. Oeyen, Die Lehre von den göttlichen Kräften bei Justin // *SP* 11 (1972) 214–221.

[32] See J. Daniélou, Les traditions secrètes des Apôtres // *Eranos Jahrbuch* 31 (1962) 199–215; G. G. Stroumsa, Clement, Origen, and Jewish Esoteric Traditions // Hidden Wisdom: Esoteric Traditions and the Roots of Christian Mysticism (Leiden, 1996) 109–131; idem, *Paradosis*: Esoteric Traditions in Early Christianity // Hidden Wisdom… Esp. 42–43.

[33] P. Nautin, La fin des *Stromates* et les *Hypotyposes* de Clément d'Alexandrie // *VC* 30 (1976) 268–302, esp. 297–298, has demonstrated that they represented Clement's *physics* and *epoptics*. To quote A. Méhat (*Etude sur les «Stromates» de Clément d'Alexandrie* [Paris, 1966] 521), «[b]ref, si la gnose est essentiellement du domaine de la "physique", les *Hypotyposes* devaient en regorger…» Although Nautin

I am indebted here to Christian Oeyen's *Eine frühchristliche Engelpneumatologie bei Klemens von Alexandrien* (Bern, 1966), one of the few studies of Clement's Pneumatology, and perhaps the only one to emphasize the Jewish Christian heritage in Clement's theology.[34] Underlying Clement's Pneumatology is the «hierarchical» cosmology inherited from Jewish and early Christian apocalypticism, and the philosophical concern to articulate divine unity and the multiplicity of the cosmos.

Unity and Multiplicity in the Spirit

In *Strom.* 5:6, Clement provides an allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament Temple and its furnishings. Clement's exegesis follows a recognizable pattern: he introduces the object of interpretation, offers a first level of explanation, then a second one. The first level of explanation is astrological: the lamp signifies «the motions of the seven planets that perform their revolutions towards the south»; the cherubim signify the two bears, or the two hemispheres, the twelve wings and twelve stones describe for us the circle of the zodiac.[35]

A second level of interpretation is Christological:

> The golden lamp conveys another enigma as a symbol of Christ … in his casting light, «at sundry times and diverse manners», on those who believe on Him and hope, and who see by means of the ministry of the *protoctists* (διὰ τῆς τῶν πρωτοκτίστων διακονίας). And they say that the seven eyes of the Lord are the seven spirits resting on the rod that springs from the root of Jesse.[36]

---

does treat the *Adumbrationes* (his study is confined to the *Codex Laurentianus*) it is easy to see how these passages also belong to the epoptics. See Méhat, Etude… 517–522; 530–533.

[34] This booklet, published in Bern, in 1966, is a slightly revised version of Ch. Oeyen, Eine frühchristliche Engelpneumatologie bei Klemens von Alexandrien // *IKZ* 55 (1965) 102–120, and *IKZ* 56 (1966) 27–47. For Clement's Pneumatology, an altogether understudied area in Patristic studies, see also W.-D. Hauschild, Gottes Geist und der Mensch: Studien zur frühchristlichen Pneumatologie (München, 1972); L. Ladaria, El Espíritu en Clemente Alejandrino: estudio teológico antropológico (Madrid, 1980); H. Ziebritzki, Heiliger Geist und Weltseele: das Problem der dritten Hypostase bei Origenes, Plotin und ihren Vorläufern (Tübingen, 1994) 93–129. See also my «Revisiting Christian Oeyen», referred to at the beginning of this essay. For the anthropological relevance of πνεῦμα, see G. Verbeke, L'évolution de la doctrine du pneuma, du stoicisme à s. Augustin: étude philosophique (Paris—Louvain, 1945) 429–440.

[35] This interpretation is not Clement's own creation. Cf. Philo, *On the Cherubim* VII:21–24. For a comprehensive survey of Clement's debt to Philo in his exegesis of the Temple, the vestments and the high priest, see A. van den Hoek, Clement of Alexandria and His Use of Philo in the Stromateis: an Early Christian Reshaping of a Jewish Model (Leiden, 1988) 116–147.

[36] Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5:6:35.

Here Clement draws on a series of Biblical passages (Isa 11:1–2; Zech 4:2, 10; Rev 1:4; 5:6; 8:2) that might have already been combined by earlier tradition. Zechariah's seven spirits (eyes of the Lord) are Isaiah's seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, and the angelomorphic imagery, implicit in Revelation, is here affirmed explicitly: the seven «spirits» are, in fact, the seven celestial entities described as πρωτόκστιστοι, «first born». I will return to the *protoctists* in the next section of this paper. Consistent with the Christological framework in which he places the Old Testament prophecies and theophanies throughout his writings, Clement strictly subordinates the seven angelic spirits to work of the Logos.[37] The entire discussion about unity and multiplicity seems to presuppose, in descending order, the Father, the Son, and the *protoctists*. Confirmation of this idea, and a much more detailed description of the hierarchy, is provided by Clement's *Excerpta ex Theodoto* and the *Adumbrationes*.

Clement of Alexandria's «Celestial Hierarchy»[38]

On the basis of a theological tradition inherited from primitive Jewish Christian circles, Clement furnishes, especially in *Excerpta* 10, 11, and 27, a detailed description of the spiritual universe.[39] This celestial «hierarchy» — if the anachronism is acceptable — features, in descending order, the Face, the seven first created angels, the archangels, and finally the angels.[40] To

[37] It is noteworthy that the brief quotation from Heb 1:1 («at sundry times and diverse manners») is also subtly molded into an explicitly Christological affirmation: the one speaking «at sundry times and diverse manners» to the fathers is, originally, «God»; Clement, however, speaks about *Christ* casting his light «at sundry times and diverse manners».

[38] For a detailed presentation of Clement's account, see B. G. Bucur, The Other Clement of Alexandria: Cosmic Hierarchy and Interiorized Apocalypticism // *VC* 60 (2006) 251–268.

[39] The fact that Clement's strictly hierarchical universe goes back to earlier tradition has been demonstrated by older research: P. Collomp, Une source de Clément d'Alexandrie et des Homélies Pseudo-Clémentines // *Revue de philologie et littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 37 (1913); W. Bousset, Jüdisch-christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom: Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria, Justin und Irenäus (Göttingen, 1915). Despite the pertinent critique of some of Bousset's conclusions (J. Munck, Untersuchungen über Klemens von Alexandria (Stuttgart, 1933) 127–204), the thesis of a Jewish and Jewish-Christian literary source behind Clement remains solidly established: G. Kretschmar, Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie (Tübingen, 1956) 68, n. 3; Daniélou, Les traditions secrètes des Apôtres… 214; M. Roncaglia, Pantène et le Didascalée d'Alexandrie: du judéo-christianisme au christianisme hellénistique // A Tribute to Arthur Vööbus: Studies in Early Christian Literature and its Environment, Primarily in the Syrian East / Ed. R. H. Fischer (Chicago, 1977) 211–233.

[40] The term «hierarchy» was coined centuries later by the anonymous author of the Pseudo-Areopagitic Corpus. Nevertheless, the multi-storied cosmos that charac-

describe the continual propagation of light from the Face down to the lowest level of existence, Clement uses the adverb «proximately» (προσεχῶς), which suggests immediacy, the lack of any interval between the levels. Each rank of spiritual entities is «moved» by the one above it, and will, in turn, «move» the immediately lower level.[41]

The orienting principle (ἀρχή) of the hierarchy is the «Face of God», a theme whose prominence in the apocalyptic literature of Second Temple Judaism was only amplified with the emergence of Christianity.[42] For Clement, the Face of God is the Son».[43]

The first level of celestial entities contemplating the Face is constituted by the πρωτόκστιστοι, celestial beings «first created». These *protoctists* are seven, but they are simultaneously characterized by unity and multiplicity: although distinct in number, Clement writes, «their liturgy is common and undivided».[44] On the one hand, the *protoctists* are numbered with the angels and archangels, their subordinates.[45] On the other hand, they are bearers of

terizes apocalyptic writings such as the *Ascension of Isaiah*, *2 Enoch* or the *Epistula Apostolorum* can also be labeled «hierarchical». Moreover, there are some surprising similarities between the Clementinian and Dionysian «hierarchies» (see the brief note by A. Golitzin, Et Introibo Ad Altare Dei: The Mystagogy of Dionysius Areopagita, with Special Reference to its Predecessors in the Eastern Christian Tradition (Thessalonica, 1994) (Analekta Vlatadon, 59) 265).

[41] *Strom.* 6:16:148 offers a veiled description of the same hierarchical reality: «the operative power (ἡ δραστικὴ ἐνέργεια) is imparted by descent through those that are moved successively (διὰ τῶν προσεχέστερον κινουμένων)».

[42] Seow, Face… 322–325. For a theological evaluation of the theme of the Face in the Pseudepigrapha, see A. Orlov, The Enoch-Metatron Tradition (Tübingen, 2005) (TSAJ, 107), and his articles «Exodus 33 on God's Face: A Lesson From the Enochic Tradition» and «The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*», republished in A. Orlov, From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha (Leiden, 2006) (JSJ, 114) 311–325, 399–419. See also A. De Conick, Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First-Century Christology in the Second Century // The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism / Ed. C. C. Newman, J. R. Davila, G. S. Lewis (Leiden, 1999) (JSJ, 63) 327–329.

[43] *Excerpta* 10:6; 12:1. According to April De Conick (Heavenly Temple Traditions… 325), «the image of the Son as the Father's Face may have played a significant role in Valentinian theologies». However, the repeated occurrence of the same designation in Clement of Alexandria (*Paed* 1:57 and 1:124:4, *Strom* 7:58, as well as in Tertullian (*Adv. Prax.* 14), suggests that «Face» as a Christological title was at least as popular in mainstream Christianity as it was in Valentinian tradition.

[44] *Excerpta* 10:3–4; 11:4.

[45] «Hae namque primitivae virtutes ac primo creatae (rendering πρωτόγονοι καὶ πρωτόκτιστοι δυνάμεις), inmobiles exsistentes secundum substantiam, cum subiectis angelis et archangelis» (*Adumbrationes in 1 Jn 2:1*). Stählin's critical edition introduces a comma between «inmobiles» and «exsistentes». I prefer to revert to

the divine Name, and, as such, are called «gods».[46] Clement equates them with «the seven eyes of the Lord» (Zech 3:9, 4:10; Rev 5:6), the «thrones» (Col 1:16), and the «angels ever contemplating the Face of God» (Mat 18:10).[47] The *protoctists* fulfill multiple functions: in relation to Christ, they present the prayers ascending from below (*Excerpta* 27:2); on the other hand, they function as «high priests» with regard to the archangels, just as the archangels are «high priests» to the angels, and so forth (*Excerpta* 27:2). In their unceasing contemplation of the Face of God, they represent the model (προκέντιμα) of perfected souls (*Excerpta* 10:6; 11:1).

The cosmological scheme described in *Strom.* 5:6 or in the *Excerpta* seems to reserve no place to the Holy Spirit. In descending order, one reads about the Father, the Son, and the *protoctists*. The relation between the seven *protoctists* and the Holy Spirit becomes clear in the passages outlining Clement of Alexandria's theory of prophetic inspiration.

Clement's Theory of Prophetic Inspiration

Clement is aware of the two major functions traditionally ascribed to the Holy Spirit, namely the inspiration of Old Testament prophets and the indwelling of the believers.[48] However, he oftentimes ascribes the same func-

---

Zahn's text, which has no comma. Thus, I take «inmobiles exsistentes secundum substantiam» to mean that their substance is immovable according to substance, i.e., does not undergo change. A number of scholars (Zahn, Kretschmar, Barbel) identified these «powers» with two paracletes; on the other hand, the idea that the «powers» under discussion are the seven *protoctists* is supported by François Sagnard, the editor and translator of the *Excerpta* for Sources Chrétiennes (*Excerpta* 77, n. 2), and, more recently, by Ziebritzki (Heiliger Geist und Weltseele… 122, n. 148). But the most extensive argumentation has been furnished by Oeyen (Engelpneumatologie… 31–33).

[46] «Now, in the Gospel according to Mark, when the Lord was interrogated by the high priest if He was "the Christ, the Son of the blessed God", He answered saying, "I am; and you shall see the Son of man seated at the right hand of power (*a dextris virtutis*)". But "powers" indicates the holy angels. Further, when He says "at the right hand of God", he means the same ones, on account of the equality and likeness of the angelic and holy powers, which are called by the one name of God (*quae uno nominabantur nomine dei*)» (*Adumbrationes in Juda* 5:24). Clement equates here «power» in the Gospel text with «angels»; in an earlier sentence, he had equated «glory» with «angels»: «*In the presence of His glory*: he means before the angels…» (*Adumbrationes in Juda* 5:24).

[47] *Excerpta* 10; *Eclogae* 57:1. For a synthetic presentation of the *protoctists*, see A. Le Boulluec, Commentaire // Clément d'Alexandrie, *Stromate V*. Tome 2 (Paris, 1981) (SC, 279) 143.

[48] «The Holy Spirit, by Isaiah, denounces…» (*Paed* 2:1:8); «the Holy Spirit, uttering His voice by Amos» (*Paed* 2:2:30); «the Spirit prophesies by Zephaniah» (*Paed* 2:12:126); «the Spirit [says] by Solomon» (*Paed* 2:12:129). *Excerpta* 24:2 affirms

tions to the Logos, even while maintaining some role for the Holy Spirit. He affirms, for instance, that the Logos «tunes» both the great cosmos and the human microcosm through the Holy Spirit, ἁγίῳ πνεύματι (*Protr* 1:5:3).

«The Logos through the Spirit»: this expression is given a precise explanation in *Eclogae* 51–52. Here Clement describes the phenomenon of prophecy as follows: the Logos moves the first rank of the *protoctists,* this movement is transmitted from one level of the angelic hierarchy down to the next; and the lowest angelic rank, which is the one closest to the human world, transmits the «movement» to the prophet. In this light, it becomes clear how Clement understands the traditional statements about the Logos speaking to the prophets: the prophet experiences the presence and message of the Logos by receiving the «energy» of the proximate angel.[49] Here are two of the texts that treat prophecy in more detail:

> It is declared thereby that the prophets conversed with Wisdom, and that there was in them the Spirit of Christ, in the sense of possession by Christ, and subjection to Christ (*secundum possessionem et subiectionem Christi*). For the Lord works through archangels and through angels that are close (*per ... propinquos angelos*), who are called «the Spirit of Christ» (*qui Christi vocantur spiritus*).[50] ... He says, «Blessed are you, because there rests upon you that which is of his glory, and of God's honor and power, and who is His Spirit. This «his» is possessive, and designates the angelic spirit (*Hic possessivum est «eius» et angelicum spiritum significat*).[51]

Once again, the «telescopic» view of the hierarchy is presupposed, so as to convey the presence of Christ through («per», presumably rendering δία) the work of the lowest angelic level.[52] *Adumbrationes* in 1 Pet 4:14 presents three entities: God; God's Glory / Honor / Power (= «He»); the Spirit of

---

the perfect identity between the Paraclete that is working (in the Church, and the Paraclete who was active in the prophets. I will return to this text in the second part of this essay.

[49] The same phenomenon applies to the gift of philosophy to the pagans: the Logos «gave philosophy to the Greeks by means of the inferior angels», διὰ τῶν ὑποδεεστέτων ἀγγέλων (*Strom.* 7:2:6).

[50] *Spiritus Christi* could, in theory, be translated as a plural («spirits of Christ»); but Clement is here expanding on 1 Pet 4:14, ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἀναπάυεται.

[51] *Adumbrationes* in 1 Pet 2:3; *Adumbrationes* in 1 Pet 4:14.

[52] Oeyen (Engelpneumatologie... 27–28) and Hauschild (Gottes Geist... 79) identify the «angeli propinqui» with the *protoctists*. This interpretation appears to miss half of Clement's intention: the prophetic inspiration is, indeed, worked out through the *protoctists*, who are «close» to the Son; yet the movement is further transmitted in the same way to the archangels, who are «close» to the *protoctists*, and the angels, who are «close» to the archangels. Finally, the lowest angelic rank is the last element in the chain of prophetic inspiration: this is, for Clement, the «spirit» that rests upon the prophets.

God's Glory / Honor / Power (= «His Spirit»).[53] But the Spirit of Christ is treated, in a way that could hardly be more explicit, as a designation for angelic beings: archangels and kindred angels … are called «the Spirit of Christ»; «*his* Spirit» is «the *angelic* spirit». For a full discussion of this topic, the reader is referred to Oeyen's *Engelpneumatologie*. For the time being, let us consider another relevant text:

> And by one God are many treasures dispensed; some are disclosed through the Law, others through the prophets; some by the divine mouth, another by the heptad of the spirit (τοῦ πνεύματος τῇ ἑπτάδι) singing in accompaniment. And the Lord being one, is the same Instructor in all of these.[54]

According to Schlütz this text describes the revelation of the Instructor Logos as both unitary and progressive: the Logos works in the law, later in the prophets, then in the Incarnation («the divine mouth»), and, finally, the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost. Oeyen prefers a direct equation of «the divine mouth» with the Spirit, on the basis of *Protr.* 9:82:1.[55] On either view (and I argue that Clement's Spirit Christology, which will be discussed below, annuls their distinction), the expression «heptad of the spirit» refers to the Holy Spirit. This raises the problem of understanding the relation between Clement's expressions «heptad of the Spirit» and «protoctists». Is «holy spirit» a designation for the seven angels of the Face, or is «seven protoctists» a designation for the Holy Spirit? Briefly put: «angel» Pneumatology or «pneuma» angelology?

Ladaria prefers to interpret «angels» as references to the Holy Spirit.[56] Similarly, Oeyen notes, commenting on the passage discussing the *spiritus angelicus* (*Adumbrationes* in 1 Pet 4:14): «nicht nur werden Engel Geist genannt; auch der Geist wird als *engelhaft* bezeichnet», and concludes «dass es sich ohne Zweifel um den Heiligen Geist handelt, und nicht um einen niedrigeren Engel, der *Geist* im abgeschwachten Sinne genannt würde».[57] These observations amount to a distinction between «angelic» and «angelomorphic» Pneumatology. Indeed, Oeyen does not deny the Pneumatological content of passage: the seven first-created angels *are* the sevenfold Spirit in archaic «angelomorphic» language.

---

[53] For a discussion of the variant reading of 1 Pet 4:14, see Th. Zahn, Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur III: Supplementum Clementinum (Erlangen, 1884) 3: 95, n. 11; Oeyen, Engelpneumatologie… 28, n. 24.

[54] *Paed.* 3:12:87.

[55] K. Schlütz, Isaias 11:2 (Die sieben Gaben des Heiligen Geistes) in den ersten vier christlichen Jahrhunderten (Münster 1932) 77; Oeyen, Engelpneumatologie… 27, n. 22.

[56] Ladaria, El Espíritu… 254.

[57] Oeyen, Engelpneumatologie… 28 (Oeyen's Italics).

II. Angelomorphic Pneumatology is not an Island

The aim of the previous section has been to show that Levison's «angelic Spirit» continues on in early Christianity as angelomorphic Pneumatology. It seems that more has in fact been established: *Revelation*, the *Shepherd*, and certain passages from Clement of Alexandria reveal a very specific use of Jewish angelology in their reflection on the Holy Spirit. All three witnesses use the Second Temple theme of the seven supreme angels as a distinct and crucial (albeit not exclusive) building block for Pneumatology. The argument for angelomorphic Pneumatology seems to stand on solid ground. It could be strengthened by many more texts and authors; this will be the subject of future studies.

At this point it is important to inquire about the place of angelomorphic Pneumatology in the larger theological framework of our texts. Indeed, no theological phenomenon is an island! Angelomorphic Pneumatology occurs, as I will try to show, in tandem with Spirit Christology, as part of a binitarian theological framework. In what follows, I will first discuss the Spirit Christology, then also the binitarianism of Revelation, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, and Clement of Alexandria.

1. Angelomorphic Pneumatology and Spirit Christology[58]

Spirit Christology in the Book of Revelation

In all three texts dealt with above, «spirit» can also designate the Son of God.

The book of Revelation constructs a precise parallelism between the function of Christ and that of the «spirit» as described in the introductory and final parts of the seven letters (chs. 2–3). The letters are framed by an opening announcement of what Christ proclaims, and a final exhortation to hear what the Spirit says. Thus, τάδε λέγει ὁ…(completed with descriptions of Christ drawn from the Revelation 1) corresponds to … τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει.[59] It is clear that the parallelism is not an accident, and that the author consciously and consistently introduces a functional overlap between «Christ» and «Spirit». The scholarly treatment of the passage is somewhat disappointing. Commentators sometimes evade the difficulty simply by restating the obvious: the close relation between the Spirit and the exalted Christ, the fact that Christ speaks through the Spirit, etc.

[58] For the purpose of this paper, «Spirit Christology» refers to the use of πνεῦμα language to designate Christ in numerous pre-Nicene texts and authors. For a rich survey of texts, see M. Simonetti, Note di cristologia pneumatica // *Augustinianum* 12 (1972) 201–232.

[59] Rev 2:1–2:7; Rev 2:8–2:11; Rev 2:12–2:17; Rev 2:18–2:29; Rev 3:1–3:6; Rev 3:7–3:13; Rev 3:14–2:22.

First, it must be said that, of the two terms, «Christ» can only refer to the Son of God. The question is, then, to determine what «spirit» stands for: the Holy Spirit, an angel, God as inspiring agent, something else? Given the prophetic-visionary character of the textual unit Revelation 2–3, «spirit» is, in all likelihood connected to the reality of prophetic vision. This is the point where scholarly opinions begin to diverge. Schweitzer takes «Spirit» as a Christological title, derived from the act of Christ's inspiring the prophet: «the Spirit is none other than … the Ascended Christ in his role of speaking to the Church». [60] F. F. Bruce holds the opposite position: «it is not that the Spirit is identical to the exalted Lord, but that the exalted Lord speaks to the Churches by … the Spirit of prophecy … When the spirit of prophecy comes upon him, John speaks of himself as being, or becoming, "in the Spirit" (ἐν πνεύματι)». [61] In other words, «listen to what the Spirit says» would be shorthand for «listen to what Christ says through *the one who was in the spirit*».

As can be seen, the divergence can be reduced to the issue of whether «Spirit» should be relegated to the seer (Bruce), or to Christ (Schweitzer). Be that as it may, one thing is certain: πνεῦμα here is not the Holy Spirit. [62]

Schweitzer's position seems more plausible, because it accounts better for the parallelism Christ — Spirit noted above, and also because it offers the simpler solution, in comparison to transformation of τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει into [John] ἐν πνεύματι λέγει.

The hypothesis of Spirit Christology in the Book of Revelation has the advantage of accounting for the functional overlap between the «Christ» and «Spirit» without necessarily implying a simple identity between Christ and the Spirit. The identification between the OT «Spirit of God» and the NT «Spirit of Christ» is ultimately Christologically motivated, since it identifies Christ as divine. [63]

---

[60] Schweitzer, Spirit of God… 105.

[61] F. F. Bruce, The Spirit in the Apocalypse // Christ and Spirit in the New Testament: In Honour of C. F. D. Moule / Ed. B. Lindars, S. Smalley (Cambridge, 1973) 340, 339. The same position is adopted by R. Bauckham, in his book The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on the Book of Revelation (Edinburgh, 1993) 160–161.

[62] *Contra* Ch. Brütsch, La clarté de l'Apocalypse (Geneva, 1966) 58, who does not even debate the matter: «l'Esprit: *indubitablement*, le Saint-Esprit» (Italics mine).

[63] Indeed, as M. Fatehi states repeatedly (The Spirit's Relation to the Risen Lord in Paul (Tübingen, 2000) (WUNT, 128), no mediator figure among the so-called exalted, angelomorphic patriarchs is ever presented as having the same relation to the Spirit that the OT affirms of God and His Spirit. An older formulation of this thesis can be found in M. Turner, The Spirit of Christ and «divine» Christology, in // Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology / Ed. J. B. Green, M. Turner (Grand Rapids, 1994) 413–436.

Spirit Christology in the Shepherd of Hermas

When thinking of the *Shepherd's* oft-debated Spirit Christology, one text immediately leaps to mind: *filius autem spiritus sanctus est* (Sim 5.5.2). This verse, however, makes a symbolic identification between the «son» in the parable, on the one hand, and this character's symbolized counterpart, the Holy Spirit, on the other. But there are other relevant passages in the *Shepherd*.

In Sim 9.1.1, Hermas is told that the one who spoke to him in visions was the «holy spirit», and that this «spirit» was the Son of God (ἐκεῖνο γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστιν). Indeed, judging from the text of Hermas's prayer (Vis 3.1.2: «when I had fasted a great deal and asked *the Lord* to show me the revelation he had promised to show me...»), one would expect the response to come from «the Lord» as well. The «spirit», then, is the «Lord», that is, Son.[64]

In Sim 5 the *Shepherd* speaks about God sending the preexistent Holy Spirit, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ προόν, τὸ κτίσαν πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν (Sim 5.6.5). We find a clarifying parallel in Sim 9.12.1–2, where the statement concerns the Son of God: ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ πασῆς τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ προγενέστερός ἐστιν, ὥστε συμβούλον αὐτὸν γενέσθαι τῷ πατρί. The identical descriptions of the Son and the Spirit agree with the statement in Sim 9.1.1: *the Spirit is the Son of God*. There is only one subject: not the «polymorphic Holy Spirit» — *pace* Gieschen — but rather the Son of God, who is, technically, a «holy spirit».[65] To this highest «spirit» are subordinated all other «spirits», such as, for instance, the virgins discussed above.

---

[64] The title «Son» can be derived from the following two solemn declarations, whose crucial importance is highlighted by the fact that they appear at the climax of the so-called heavenly letter, preceded by a fifteen-day long fast: «The Lord (κύριος) has sworn on his Son that those who deny their Lord (κύριος) have been disenfranchised from their life» (Vis 2.2.8). While the first κύριος refers to God, the second one obviously designates the Son. This is also the idea underlying several text witnesses: L1 and E have «filium», while S* reads χριστόν — see Joly , in SC 53, pp 92–93, n. 5. The reference to «*their* Lord» is significant, as it parallels Sim 5.5.3 and Sim 5.6.4, where the Son of God is proclaimed as «Lord of the people». A theology advocating «two Lords» is rightly termed «binitarian monotheism».

[65] According to Gieschen, all revelational characters (including the Son / slave / flesh) are «a manifestation of the Spirit», in the context of «a very fluid angelomorphic Pneumatology» (*Angelomorphic Christology* 222, 225). The idea of a second-century version of binitarian monotheism featuring not the Son, but the Spirit as God's vice-regent and sole polymorphic mediator has been pursued further by M. R. Barnes («Early Christian Binitarianism: The Father and the Holy Spirit», paper read at the North American Patristics Society in 2001, online at www.mu.edu/maqom/barnes).

Spirit Christology in Clement of Alexandria

Clement frequently uses «Logos» and «Pneuma» as synonyms, switching between them repeatedly and without much explanation.[66]

In *Strom.* 5:6, Clement ascribes the creation and sustenance of the cosmos, and the divine revelation to humankind, to the «Name», «Son», «Savior», or «Logos». Nevertheless, the Word's role in organizing the cosmos and in prophetic revelation is illustrated by a quote from 1 Cor 12:11 («the self-same Holy Spirit works in all»). Moreover, the Scripture verse is soon afterwards reworked in a Christological key: «God the Savior works … it is the same Logos which prophesies, and judges, and discriminates all things». There seems to be a perfect parallel between the reference to the Spirit and the reference to the Son: both are introduced as inspired, prophetic ideas («the apostles were at once prophets and righteous»; «the oracle exhibits the prophecy which by the Word cries and preaches… since it is the same Word which prophesies».); both use ἐνεργέω; both designate «what is one», and at the same time becomes «what is many». It seems that Clement operates a translation *sui generis* of Cor 12:11 into his own theological idiom: the «Spirit» mentioned by the Apostle is identified as the Logos.

In *Excerpta* 24:2, a text directed against the dualist views of the Valentinians, Clement affirms the perfect identity (i.e., an identity of οὐσία and δύναμις) between the Paraclete that is working (ἐνεργῶν) in the Church, and the Paraclete who was active (ἐνεργήσαντι) in the prophets. Implicit here is the identification of Paraclete with the Logos, because (a) Clement had previously affirmed that it is the Logos who was at work in the prophets (ἐνεργήσας, *Excerpta* 19:2); (b) the adverb «proximately» (προσεχῶς), qualifying the action of the Paraclete, functions as a technical term in Clement's description of how the Logos transforms the perfect souls towards god-

[66] *Paed.* 1:6:43: «the Lord Jesus, the Word of God, that is, the Spirit made flesh». Commenting on the fourth commandment of the Decalogue, Clement explains: «The seventh day, therefore, is proclaimed a rest … preparing for the Primal Day, our true rest; which, in truth, is the first creation of light, in which all things are viewed and possessed. …For the light of truth, a light true, casting no shadow, is the Spirit of God indivisibly divided to all… By following Him, therefore, through our whole life, we become impassible; and this is to rest» (*Strom.* 6:16:138). «Day» and «true Light» are quite transparently referring to Christ (cf. John 1:4–8; 8:56), as becomes clear immediately afterwards, when the text speaks about following Christ. However, the latter's identity is, in this passage, «Spirit of God». Clement is obviously drawing on an archaic Christology designating the preexistent Christ as πνεῦμα, interchangeably with λόγος. This seems to be a widespread phenomenon, present in Syria-Palestine, Alexandria, Carthage, and Rome, in authors speaking Latin, Greek and Syriac. See the texts and analyses in Simonetti, Note…, and R. Cantalamessa, L'omelia in S. Pascha dello Pseudo-Ippolito di Roma. Ricerche sulla teologia dell'Asia Minore nella seconda metà del II secolo (Milano, 1967) 171–185.

likeness (*Excerpta* 27:3; 27:6). It is the same term used to describe the lack of any interval between the levels of the celestial hierarchy.

The same exegetical procedure occurs in *Excerpta* 17: Clement discusses the work of the δύναμις in the world. Here and elsewhere in Clement, δύναμις is a Christological term.[67] The Biblical proof texts, however, are, once again, references to πνεῦμα: John 4:24 («God is Spirit») and John 3:8 («He blows wherever He desires»).

Clement ends *Strom.* 4:26:172 with the following words: «I shall pray the Spirit of Christ to wing me (εὐξαίμην τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ πτερῶσαι με) to my Jerusalem». Very similarly, the final hymn of the *Instructor* calls upon Christ as the «wing (πτερόν) of unwandering birds», and «heavenly wing (πτερὸν οὐράνιον) of the all-holy flock».[68] The evident parallelism between the invocations in *Strom.* 4:26:172 and *Paed* 3:12:101 suggests that «Spirit of Christ» is simply Christ in his function of heavenly guide.

There are at least three factors that determine the overlap between Spirit and Logos. First, Clement deploys an all-encompassing theory of the Logos, and thereby inevitably claims for the Logos certain areas of activity traditionally associated with the Spirit, namely the inspiration of Scripture and the charismatic empowerment of the believer.[69] Second, Clement follows the Philonic model of «translating» Scriptural terms and images into philosophical concepts, and «explains» the Biblical πνεῦμα in light of the philosophical «Logos» principle.[70] Third, the term δύναμις seems to facilitate the equation of Spirit and Logos, insofar as Clement uses it alternatively for the Logos and the Spirit.[71]

***

[67] *Excerpta* 4:2; 12:3; *Strom.* 7:2:7; 7:2:9. See also Sagnard's comments in *Excerpta*, 79, n. 2.

[68] *Instructor* 3:12:101.

[69] Cf. Zahn, *Forschungen*, 98: [der Geist] «den er wie die Alten so oft in seinen Speculationen über das Verhältnis des Logos zu Gott und zur Welt regelmässig übergeht»; Kretschmar, *Trinitätstheologie*, 63: «im allgemeinen denkt er [Klemens] logozentrisch, der Geist tritt zurück». Ladaria (El Espíritu… 25) notes that the Spirit's «efficient causality» in the phenomenon of inspiration is equally applied to the Logos or Kyrios, especially in the *Instructor*. He believes, however, that these coincidences do not amount to an identification of the Word and the Spirit.

[70] Simonetti (Note di cristologia pneumatica… 209) thinks primarily of Stoic influence: «In ambienti culturalmente impregnate e perciò apperti all'influsso stoico avrà operato in tal senso anche l'identificazione fra *logos* e *pneuma*». Lilla and Osborn argue for Middle Platonism.

[71] J. Frangoulis, Der Begriff des Geistes πνεῦμα bei Clemens Alexandrinus (Leipzig, 1936) 16, also makes a brief note to this effect: «[es] findet sich bei Clemens auch eine enge Verbindung von Pneuma und Sohn in dem übergeordneten Begriff des δύναμις».

The very same texts that instantiate an early Christian angelomorphic Pneumatology are also familiar with a different use of πνεῦμα: «Spirit» as a designation of the second divine Person. Angelomorphic Pneumatology and Spirit Christology are closely linked and form a «tandem» that can be detected in all three texts discussed above, as well as in other early Christian writings. The connection between Angelomorphic Pneumatology and Spirit Christology is hardly surprising, since both depend on the notion of πνεῦμα as a celestial entity. Spirit Christology can be understood as a Christological reworking of the «angelic spirit», one in which the Son of God is conceived of as the highest such «spirit». Needless to say, such use of «spirit» language in the service of Christology is widespread in early Christianity.[72]

One other element that must be taken into account is the binitarian framework associated with the combination of angelomorphic Pneumatology and Spirit Christology.

2. A Binitarian Theological Framework

A certain binitarian monotheism, positing a «second power in heaven», God's vice-regent, is an important part of Christianity's Jewish roots.[73] Indeed, the «second power» — the Glory, the Name, the Wisdom, the Power, the Angel, the Son of Man — was bound to «become a central metaphor for Christ in Christianity».[74] In the New Testament, this is especially obvious in the Fourth Gospel and the Pauline Corpus. Towards the middle of the second

[72] Ch. Stead, Philosophy in Christian Antiquity (Cambridge, 1994) 155–156; R. C. Lilla, Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism (London, 1971) 26, 53; F. Loofs, Theophilus von Antiochien Adversus Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus (Leipzig, 1930) (TU, 46) 114–205; Simonetti, Note di cristologia pneumatica… 230–231; B. Studer, La Soteriologie de Lactance // Lactance et son temps: Recherches Actuelles. Actes du IV[e] Colloque d'Etudes Historiques et Patristiques, Chantilly 21–23 septembre 1976 / Ed. J. Fontaine, M. Perrin (Paris, 1978) 252–271, here 259–260, 270–271.

[73] An excellent collection of relevant articles is found in J. R. Davila et al. (eds.), The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus (Leiden, 1999). See also A. Segal, Two Powers In Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism (Leiden, 1977); M. Barker, The Great Angel: A Study of Israel's Second God (Westminster, 1992); G. Quispel, Der Gnostische Anthropos und die Jüdische Tradition // *Gnostic Studies* I (Istanbul, 1974) 173–195; J. Fossum, Gen. 1:26 and 2:7 in Judaism, Samaritanism and Gnosticism // *JSJ* 16 (1985) 202–239; P. A. Rainbow, Jewish Monotheism as the Matrix for New Testament Christology: A Review Article // *NT* 33 (1991) 78–91; idem, Monotheism — A Misused Word in Jewish Studies? // *JJS* 42 (1991) 1–15.

[74] A. Segal, Paul the Convert. The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee (New Haven—London, 1990) 41.

century, when Justin Martyr writes his *Dialogue with Trypho*, this type of binitarian monotheism was still accepted by both Christians *and* Jews, the dividing issue being the Christian identification of Jesus with the «second God». On the way to a mature Trinitarian theology, a certain binitarian tendency is often noticeable among Christian authors.[75]

How do we recognize whether a text is unitarian, binitarian, trinitarian? I appeal here to the principle developed by Larry Hurtado, which may be reduced to the following formula: that which is considered «God» is necessarily the object of worship; and that which is the object of worship is considered «God».[76]

It is with this perspective in mind that I ask the question: «Who is 'God' in the Book of Revelation?» The specific Jewish-Christian indicators of a belief in God are abundantly present in this text: the divine name, the divine throne, the worship. All three indicators point to the same theological view: God and His Son. The bearer of the divine name is the Father (Rev 1:4, 8; 4:8; 11;17; 15:3; 16:7, 14; 19:6, 15; 21:22);[77] but a variation of the divine name is also attributed to the Son.[78] The divine throne is occupied jointly by the Father

[75] See, in this respect, Loofs, Theophilus… 114–205; Simonetti, Note di cristologia pneumatica… 230–231; W. Macholz, Spuren binitarischer Denkweise im Abendlande seit Tertullian (Jena, 1902); E. Osborn, Clement of Alexandria (Cambridge, 2005) 152.

[76] L. Hurtado, At the Origins of Christian Worship (Grand Rapids, 1999); idem, Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity (Grand Rapids, 2003) Esp. 11–53.

[77] The fact that «He-Who-Is» functions as a stand-in for YHWH explains why the writer refuses to subject the Name to the rules of declension in Rev 1:4. Prigent (Commentary on the Apocalypse… 115) explains the following: «it is impossible to suppose that … it was not deliberate, especially since the same expression is repeated later (1:8; 4:8; 11:17; 16:5) with the same persistence in making a noun out of the imperfect form of the verb "to be". …the titles of the eternal God cannot be subjected to temporal vicissitudes, and consequently to the laws of noun declension. The God in question is one who can only act as subject».

[78] See Aune, Revelation… 1:51–59; S. McDonough, YHWH at Patmos (Tübingen, 1999) (WUNT, 107) 195–231. Martin McNamara found that the passage «is perfectly paralleled in TJI Dt 32, 39 and in this text alone of those available to us… It is not to be excluded that the Apocalypse is directly dependent on TJI Dt 32, 39 in its use of it, although it is possible that both texts are dependent on the same early liturgical tradition» (M. McNamara, The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch (Rome, 1966) (Analecta Biblica, 27) 98–112, here 112). Whether the author of Revelation draws on Jewish or Greek traditions, or perhaps on a fusion of both, he is also subjecting the preexisting formulae to his own theological views. For instance, his eschatological perspective dictates an original modification of the third member of the *Dreizeitenformel* from «who will be» to «who will come» (so Ben Witherington III, Revelation (Cambridge—New York, 2003) 75).

and the Lamb. And, most importantly, worship is given to the God and His Son, or Lamb.[79] Within this binitarian framework, the Spirit appears at the same time indissolubly linked to the worshipped second person («seven horns of the Lamb», «seven eyes of the Lord», «seven stars in the Lord's hand»), and strictly subordinated to it («the seven holy spirits before the throne»).

Since the binitarianism of the *Shepherd of Hermas* requires no further exposition, I move directly to Clement of Alexandria. Some decades ago, W. H. C. Frend stated bluntly that «Clement's theology was really binitarian», and that although «he mentions the Spirit as the agent of Faith in the believer, there would appear to be little real place for Him in his system».[80] More recently, Henning Ziebritzki concludes, after a detailed study, that Clement has virtually no Pneumatology, and hence no conception yet of a third hypostasis.[81]

Approaching matters from a different angle, and using Hurtado's principle, one comes to the same conclusion: Clement is very reluctant to include the Spirit as a recipient of worship.[82] He sometimes presents the Fa-

[79] «Then I heard every creature in heaven and on earth and under the earth and in the sea, and all that is in them, singing, "*To the one seated on the throne and to the Lamb* be blessing and honor and glory and might forever and ever!" And the four living creatures said, "Amen!" And the elders fell down and worshiped» (Rev 5:13–14); «Then the kings of the earth and the magnates and the generals and the rich and the powerful, and everyone, slave and free, hid in the caves and among the rocks of the mountains, calling to the mountains and rocks, "Fall on us and hide us from the face of *the one seated on the throne and from the wrath of the Lamb*; for the great day of their wrath has come, and who is able to stand?"» (Rev 6:15–17); «*Salvation belongs to our God who is seated on the throne, and to the Lamb!*» (Rev 7:10); «Over these the second death has no power, but they will be priests *of God and of Christ*, and they will reign with him a thousand years» (Rev 20:6); «They have been redeemed from humankind as first fruits *for God and the Lamb*…» (Rev 14:4); «I saw no temple in the city, for *its temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb*. And the city has no need of sun or moon to shine on it, for *the glory of God is its light, and its lamp is the Lamb*» (Rev 21:22–23).

[80] W. H. C. Frend, Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church: A Study of a Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus (Garden City, NY, 1967) 264.

[81] Ziebritzki, Heiliger Geist... 123: «Klemens hat explizit den Heiligen Geist weder in seiner individuellen Substanz begriffen, noch seinen metaphysischen Status auch nur ansatzweise bestimmt. Damit fehlen aber auch die entscheidenden Voraussetzungen, die es erlauben würden, im klementinischen Verständnis des Heiligen Geistes den Ansatz zum Begriff einer dritten göttlichen Hypostase zu sehen». For a more favorable assessment of Clement's efforts, see E. Osborn, *Clement of Alexandria* (Cambridge, 2005). I engage Osborn's view at length in my Revisiting Christian Oeyen (referred to above).

[82] The hymn to Christ, at the end of the *Instructor* mentions hymns of praise addressed either to the Father, or to the Son, or to both — but never to the Holy Spirit.

ther alone receiving praise *through* (δία) the Son and the Holy Spirit.[83] Especially significant are the instances in which Clement suggest a subordination of the Holy Spirit to both the Father and the Son. For instance, in the following passage he calls only the Father and the Son «God»: «they know not what a "treasure in an earthen vessel" we bear, protected as it is by the power of God the Father, and the blood of God the Son, and the dew of the Holy Spirit».[84]

Clement is of course aware of Trinitarian formulae. However, the framework of his theology is binitarian. Within this framework, the angelomorphic Spirit appears as subordinated to the second Person (the *protoctists* ministering before the Face of God, «the powers» of the Logos / Spirit), and as the «instrument» by which the Logos operates in creation.

***

The second part of this essay has now come to an end. The question was to establish whether or not there are specific theological elements associated with angelomorphic Pneumatology. It is a fact that in all three texts — *Revelation*, *Shepherd*, and the Clementinian passages — angelomorphic Pneumatology occurs in a binitarian theological framework, and alongside Spirit Christology. It makes good sense, therefore, not to consider angelomorphic Pneumatology in itself, but rather in relation to Spirit Christology and binitarianism, as part of a larger theological whole. The articulation of angelomorphic Pneumatology, Spirit Christology and binitarianism can be summed up in the formula «Father, Son / Spirit, and angelomorphic Spirit». The question at this point is how to interpret these data.

III. Theological Interpretation

Measured against the standard of later Orthodoxy, Revelation, the *Shepherd* and Clement appear seriously inadequate. In historical perspective, however, angelomorphic Pneumatology is simply a phase in Christian reflection on the Holy Spirit. The use of Second Temple themes, such as the «angelic spirit» and the apocalyptic «angels of the Face», as building-blocks in the articulation of early Christian Pneumatology, illustrates the general indebtedness of pre-Nicene theology to the categories inherited from Second Temple

In the closing chapter of the *Instructor* (*Paed.* 3:12:101) praise, glory, worship are directed «to the only Father and Son, Son and Father, the Son — Instructor and Teacher, — together with the Holy Spirit» (τῷ μόνῳ πατρί καὶ υἱῷ, υἱῷ καὶ πατρί, παιδαγωγῷ καὶ διδασκάκῳ υἱῷ, σὺν καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι). As noted by Ziebritzki (Geist und Weltseele… 124), the reference to the Holy Spirit seems a mere afterthought.

[83] E.g., *Quis Dives* 42:20.

[84] Clement of Alexandria, *Quis Dives* 34:1.

Judaism. Angelic and angelomorphic Pneumatology occurs (in full-blown form, or merely as remnants of older tradition) in many other texts and authors. This way of thinking and speaking about the Holy Spirit was still an option in the fourth century.[85] However, with the advent of the new theological paradigm in the wake of the Arian and Pneumatomachian controversies, the angelomorphic Holy Spirit became highly problematic, and ultimately a theological liability. So much can be said from a historical perspective. A few notes from a systematic theological point of view are now in order.

First, it is useful to remind ourselves constantly of the fact that using terms such as «angelomorphic Pneumatology» or «Spirit Christology» we affirm something about the author's theological *language*, not about the theological *reality* signified by the language. These terms are not meant as a description of the Godhead, but rather as an aid to understand *how an author or a text chooses to speak about things divine*.

Second, there exists in early Christianity a certain incongruence between the «creedal» level of theology (i.e., *what* is defined as normative faith) and the «functional» level of theology (i.e., *how* faith is expressed theologically). Obviously, articulating a Trinitarian doctrine, in order to reflect a Trinitarian experience of God, took longer than the introduction of Trinitarian formulae.

Third, the overlap of Christ and the Spirit («Spirit Christology»), and the overlap of divine and angelic manifestation («angelomorphic Spirit») stem from the *functional identity* of Christ, the Holy Spirit and the angel as grasped by religious experience. Many of the passages discussed in this essay describe the divine action upon the believer, and especially (perhaps paradigmatically) the divine action in the prophet.[86] It is legitimate to say, then, that these texts «do not set forth the Spirit's nature [τὸν φύσιν], but … the variety

[85] See the brief summary in R. P. Vaggione, Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution (Oxford, 2000) 122–123 (discussion) and n. 270 (patristic references).

[86] Most passages in Clement which contain angelomorphic Pneumatology (e.g., in the *Adumbrationes*) center around the phenomenon of prophecy. In his hierarchy, the lowest angelic rank, and, by consequence, the one closest to the human world, transmits the divine «movement» to the prophet. Clearly, the prophet represents the highest level in the human hierarchy, the link with the celestial realm. A few centuries later, the Ps.-Areopagite will assign this position to the bishop. Clement, instead, seems much closer on this issue to the *Shepherd* (Mand 11:9), for whom the point of contact between the inspiring angel and the community of believers is the prophet. In *Revelation*, the statement about the angel being «a fellow servant» with the prophet (Rev 19:10; 22:8–9) may serve, on the one hand, to correct any angelolatric tendencies (cf. Tobit 12:16–22; Col 2:18, *Ascension of Isaiah* 7:21–23; 8:4–5; *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* 6:13–15); but, on the other hand, «John's purpose was … perhaps, to claim for his brothers a certain primacy in the affairs of churches» (M. Kiddle, The Revelation of St. John (London, 1963) 449).

of the effectual working [τῆς ἐνεργείας]».[87] To take the «Father, Son / Spirit, and angelomorphic Spirit» scheme as a (very deficient) statement on *theologia* rather than *oikonomia* would be not only an anachronism, but also a theological misinterpretation.

Finally, the prophetic-visionary context of the writings discussed in this essay should also lead the reader to recognize their mystagogic role. This aspect is most explicit in the *Shepherd*: again and again we see that with Hermas's spiritual growth his perception of celestial realities and ability to comprehend their meaning also improve.[88] Revelation, the *Shepherd*, and the Clementinian writings are simply not designed to be approached like extraneous objects. Their function is rather to draw the reader into reenacting the same type of dynamic message-appropriation which they narrate.[89] What, then, of the angelomorphic description of the Spirit? We should perhaps borrow a page from Hermas: *Sir, I do not see the meaning of these similitudes, nor am I able to comprehend them, unless you explain them to me* (Sim 5.3.1, ANF).*

[87] Basil the Great, *De Spirit* 8:17. Along the same lines, I find it interesting that the angelomorphism of the Spirit reemerges in the writings of no less than the champion of Byzantine theology in the fourteenth century, Gregory Palamas. This author is uninhibited in using precisely those Biblical verses that had once supported angelomorphic Pneumatology. In his *Fifth Antirhetikos Against Akindynos* (chs. 15; 17), Gregory Palamas identifies the seven gifts of the Spirit in Isaiah 11 with the seven eyes of the Lord (Zech 4:10), the seven spirits of Revelation, and the «finger / spirit of God» (Luke 11:20; Mat 12:28): all of these, he says, designate the divine *energies* referred to in Scripture as seven, and should therefore not be considered created. The exact same cluster of passages occurs also in Palamas' *One Hundred and Fifty Chapters* (70–71).

[88] «…the angel of repentance, he came to me and said, 'I wish to explain to you what the Holy Spirit that spoke with you in the form of the Church showed you, for that Spirit is the Son of God. For, as you were somewhat weak in the flesh, it was not explained to you by the angel. *When, however, you were strengthened by the Spirit, and your strength was increased, so that you were able to see the angel also, then accordingly was the building of the tower shown you by the Church.* In a noble and solemn manner did you see everything as if shown you by a virgin; but now you see [them] through the same Spirit as if shown by an angel. You must, however, learn everything from me with greater accuracy…» (Sim 9.1.1, ANF).

[89] I have found inspiration in the similar treatment of Origen and Evagrius proposed by V. Niculescu, in his articles: Spiritual Leavening: The Communication and Reception of the Good News in Origen's Biblical Exegesis and Transformative Pedagogy // *JECS* (forthcoming); Coping With the Grief of Ignorance: Evagrius Ponticus's Hermeneutics of the Distance Between God and Humanity // *Arches* 7 (2004) 107–120 (also available online at www.arches.ro).

* I am very grateful to Dr. James Miller and Hieromonk Dr. Alexander Golitzin, who proofread advanced drafts of this paper, and provided critical feedback. Any remaining errors are my sole responsibility.

ABSTRACT

Building on John R. Levison's study on «The Angelic Spirit in Early Judaism», which documented the widespread use of the term «spirit» as a designation for an angelic presence, this essay argues the presence of an «angelomorphic Pneumatology» in three early Christian sources: the book of Revelation, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, and Clement of Alexandria. It is argued that angelomorphic Pneumatology occurs in tandem with Spirit Christology, within a binitarian theological framework. This larger theological articulation results in a quasi-Trinitarian structure of the divine world, featuring the Father, the Son/Spirit, and the angelomorphic Spirit. The final section of the essay proposes a theological interpretation of these data.

Dragoş-Andrei Giulea
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

SEEKING TO SEE HIM AT THE FESTIVAL OF PASCHA: GLORY-SOTERIOLOGY IN EARLY CHRISTIAN PASCHAL MATERIALS AND RABBINIC LITERATURE[1]

Previous scholars have undertaken seminal investigations concerning the Paschal or Pesach messianic expectations present in both Christian and rabbinic documents, as well as similar hints in the Hebrew Scriptures or pseudepigraphic writings.[2] However, the present article tries to analyze the same festival from a different perspective, namely the apocalyptic one, and to focus on a particular theme, the divine glory, *Shekinah*, or *kabod*, in two of its particular aspects, namely the tradition regarding the salvific function of the *kabod* and its spatial descent. I would call this conception of salvation glory-soteriology or *kabod*-soteriology. Both themes seem to be part of old priestly traditions and preserved in the later Christian and rabbinical theologies of Pascha or Pesach. Accordingly, this article argues that both the early rabbinic materials on Pesach and the early Christian Paschal homilies of Asia Minor testify to the expectation of divine glory at the time of the Pesach/Paschal festival. The main rationale for this expectation consists of the salvific function of the divine *kabod*, and the festival of Pascha the privileged time for the divine descent and manifestation. Since the same expectation may be also encountered in some of the Jewish documents of the Second Temple period ascribed to Philo, the present study suggests that the rabbinic and Christian expectations of divine glory represent two different developments of a previous feature in the Second Temple festival of Pesach. Observing these materials from a mystical perspective, it seems that all of them (and even others such as the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, or the Christian liturgies) reflect the existence of a form of mysticism that engages a whole community and

[1] The expression «Seeking to See Him» is inspired by the well-known work of April De Conick: Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas (Leiden—New York, 1996).

[2] See, for example, A. Strobel, *NT* 2 (1958) 199–227; *ZNW* 49 (1958) 157–196; *NTS* 4 (1958): 210–215; Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem (Leiden, 1961); and R. Le Déaut, La nuit pascale. Essai sur la signification de la Pâque juive à partir du Targum d'Exode XII 42 (Rome, 1963).

not only an individual. Pascha was therefore a community-centered, not individual, form of mysticism, where the liturgical celebration represented the prescribed steps in which the mystical experience (or at least the preparation for this experience) should materialize.

1. The Origins of *Kabod*-Soteriology

Historical investigations on the origins of the Jewish festival of Pesach have not draw a definite conclusion concerning the time when the theme of the divine light became part of the Passover symbolism. While historians still debate whether the festival's origins were nomadic, semi-nomadic, pastoral or agricultural, the concept of salvation from the Egyptian slavery appears to be a further addition.[3] T. Prosic generally views the light as «a sign of the act of creation» in opposition to the dark powers of the primordial chaos.[4] Occurring in the first month at the vernal equinox, Pascha implies all the positive symbolisms associated with the sun and the new harvest: from order and creation, to salvation and perfection.[5]

Nevertheless, the connection between the vision of the divine light and the idea of salvation was a very ancient belief in Israel, as some of the proto-Isaianic oracles may prove. Thus, the concept seems to go back to the pre-exilic time.[6] A passage such as Isaiah 9:2–3 is most likely part of an oracle

[3] J. B. Segal, The Hebrew Passover from the Earliest Times to AD 70 (London, 1963); H. Haag, Vom alten zum neuen Pascha. Geschichte und Theologie des Osterfestes (Stuttgart, 1971); E. Otto, פסח pāsah? // TDOT. Vol. 12. 1–24; T. Prosic, The Development and Symbolism of Passover until 70 CE (London—New York, 2004). T. Prosic makes a general review of the previous theories on the origins of the festival (Prosic, 19–32). She maintains that the recent developments in the history of early Israel have eliminated the nomadic theory (Prosic, The Development and Symbolism… 32); moreover, she supports the theory of a single origin for Passover, Unleavened Bread, and Sheaf (Ibid. 69).

[4] Prosic, The Development and Symbolism… 99–100.

[5] Ibid. 83–97. A similar perspective may be encountered in Le Déaut, where he explains the later rabbinic symbolism of the Pesach: «Si la Pâque (et l'Exode) est décrite comme une sorte de création nouvelle, celle-ci s'accompagnera, comme la première, de la victoire de la lumière sur les ténèbres du chaos» (Le Déaut, La nuit pascale… 232).

[6] According to M. Smith, solar language, a common element of the Near East as early as the second millennium, developed in ancient Israel in a first stage as a general terminology for theophanic luminosity. In a second stage, monarchy played an important influence in associating the solar symbolisms with Yahweh (M. S. Smith, The Bear Eastern Background of the Solar Language for Yahweh // *JBL* 109/1 (1990) 29–39). Cf. Segal, The Hebrew Passover…; Prosic, The Development and Symbolism…; H. P. Stähli, Solare Elemente im Jahweglauben des Alten Testaments (Freiburg—Göttingen, 1985) (OBO, 66); B. Langer, Gott als «Licht» in Israel und Mesopotamien: Eine Studie zu Jes. 60:1–3.19f. (Klosterneuburg, 1989) (Öster-

related to the Assyrian invasion between 734 and 732 BC when Tiglath-pileser III annexed three Samarian provinces to Assyria: the Way of the Sea, Trans-Jordan, and Galilee of the nations (i.e., Dor, Megiddo, and Gilead).[7]

> The people who walked in darkness (חשך) have seen a great light (אור); those who lived in a land of deep darkness — on them light (אור) has shined. You have multiplied the nation, you have increased its joy; they rejoice before (פנים = face) you.[8]

It seems that the proto-Isaianic oracles unveil a large and democratic accessibility to the vision of divine glory, which probably represented the general expectation of the entire people of Israel. The meaning of this democratic accessibility to divine glory is rooted in its salvific power. Isaiah 9:2–3 seems to be, therefore, one of the first testimonies that reflect the fact that the oldest attested Jewish theological conception of the vision of God's glory envisages this event as presupposing the manifestation of salvific power. Other passages with the same soteriological emphasis, either in the Isaianic texts or in psalms, seem to be a later, post-exilic development.

The prophetic text appears to make a reference in chapter 9 to a future time, when the people of Israel will be saved from the Assyrian oppression and will be elevated to the highest and happiest possible status: to be in the light (אור) of Yahweh and see his face (פנים). In addition, the well-known Jewish tradition that identifies God's glory with his face can be encountered in this context. One can see a few verses further that the salvific status will not be just a temporary phenomenon but one extended without limit into the future. It will be a kingdom of Davidic descent, led by a child who is an «everlasting father (אב עד)» (9:6), in which an «endless peace (שלום אין קץ)» will be established and justice and righteousness will be instituted «from this time onward and forevermore (עד)» (9:7). Consequently, all these descriptions of the future salvation highlight the eschatological aspect of the text.

According to the Isaianic author, in the eschatological times the people of God will acquire the luminous or glorious characteristics of Yahweh. While 6:3 describes Yahweh as «luminous» («Holy [קדוש], Holy, Holy, is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory [כבוד]»),[9] 4:2 ascribes the same

---

reichisches biblische Studien, 7); J. G. Taylor, Yahweh and the Sun: Biblical and archaeological evidence for sun worship in ancient Israel (Sheffield, Engl., 1993). See also the authors from the note 7.

[7] E. D. Kissane, The Book of Isaiah (Dublin, 1960), 104. R. E. Clements, Isaiah 1–39 (London, 1980), 34; J. D. W. Watts, Isaiah 1–33 (Waco, 1985) (World Biblical Commentary, 24) 133–134; J. J. Collins, Isaiah (Collegeville, 1986) 106; H. Wildberger, Isaiah 1–12. A Commentary (Minneapolis, 1991) 394.

[8] Isa 9:2–3 [NRSV translation for the present study].

[9] קדש does not have only the meaning of «separated», which is probably a later development; its root — קד — also carries the meaning of «bright», an adjective

attribute to the eschatological human condition: «On that day the branch of the Lord (Yahweh) shall be beautiful and glorious (כבוד)». The glory is also a central element of the soteriological geography in which certain terrestrial and sacred places, such as the mount of Zion or the city of Jerusalem, represent the inhabited domains of salvation:

> Whoever is left in Zion and remains in Jerusalem will be called holy (קדוש), everyone who has been recorded for life in Jerusalem ... The Lord will create over the whole site of Mount Zion and over its places of assembly a cloud by day and smoke and a shining (נגה) of a flaming fire by night. Indeed over all the glory (כבוד) there will be a canopy.[10]

The fragment 46:13, which is part of the deutero-Isaianic corpus, reflects even more clearly the connection between salvation, glory, and a special geography of salvation: «I will put salvation (תשועה) in Zion, for Israel my glory (תפארה)».

The idea of sacred geography is important for every religious manifestation, because it implies search, pilgrimage, procession, and festival.[11] Thus, the theme of procession towards the divine light may be encountered in the second chapter of Isaiah: «O house of Jacob, come, let us walk in the light of the Lord» (2:5). 2:3 may also be a good example for the idea of procession to the sacred mountain of the Lord where his temple is located: «Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; that he may teach us his ways and that we may walk in his paths». However, a key text where the concepts of light and salvation start being connected with a certain festival for Yahweh seems to be the deutero-Isaianic passage of 33:20–22, written probably at the time of the Second Temple:

> Look on Zion, the city of our appointed festivals! Your eyes will see Jerusalem, a quiet habitation, an immovable tent, whose stakes will never be pulled up, and none of whose ropes will be broken. But there the Lord in majesty (אדיר) will be for us a place of broad rivers and streams, where

used especially for divinity and the things related to the divine. (W. Kornfeld, H. Ringgren, קדש qdš // TDOT. Vol. 12. 521–545).

[10] Isa 4:3–5. Cf. Isa 28:5: «In that day the Lord of hosts will be a garland of glory (צבי), and a diadem of beauty (תפארה = also «glory», «splendor»), to the remnant of his people». Cf. Isa 33:20–21. Another ancient text, the fragment of Exodus 15, generally called the Song at the Sea, sees salvation as an eternal dwelling in Yahweh's sacred sanctuary; Exod 15:17–18: «You brought them and planted them in the mountain of your own possession, the place (מכון), O Lord (Yahweh), that you made your abode (ישב), the sanctuary (מקדש), O Lord, that your hands have established. The Lord will reign forever and ever (עד)».

[11] Cf. M. Eliade, Patterns in Comparative Religion (New York, 1958); idem, The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion (New York—Harcourt—Brace, 1959); idem, Images and Symbols: Studies in Religious Symbolism (New York, 1961).

> no galley with oars can go, nor stately ship can pass. For the Lord is our judge, The Lord is our ruler, the Lord is our king; he will save (ישע) us.

The book of Psalms discloses a similar perspective of salvation in the glory of Yahweh, as one can see, for example, in Psalm 68. Moreover, the context of Psalm 68 does not appear to be an ordinary Temple service (like probably those of 26; 27; 63:2; 68:35; or 99), but a special festival where an embedded procession represents a significant ingredient of the celebration:

> 7/O God (אלהים), when you went out before your people, when you marched through the wilderness, /8/ the earth quaked, the heavens poured down rain at the presence (פנים) of God, the God of Sinai, at the presence (פנים) of God, the God of Israel. /... 24/ Your solemn processions (הליכה) are seen, O God, the processions of my God, my King, into the sanctuary (קדש) — /25/the singers in front, the musicians last, between them girls playing tambourines.

While in Psalms 67:1–2, 80:3, and 80:7 God's shining face or presence (פנים) procures salvation (ישועה), Psalm 104 makes clear that the manifestation of פנים is the way God grants life to all creatures.[12] Most likely, the central significance of the *visio Dei* in the Isaianic and Psalmic corpora is the salvation of the people of Jerusalem, and for this reason the expectation of *visio Dei* probably becomes a key social feature. Speaking about the light of theophany in the Old Testament, Aalen states: «The primary purpose of the theophany of God is the deliverance and salvation of the nation and of the individual».[13]

Certainly, the manifestation of God's glory in the books of Isaiah and Psalms may include other functions, such as punishing the enemies, or proving that God is the ultimate source of knowledge, kingship, judgment, or lawgiving.[14]

---

[12] Ps 104:29–31: «You hide your face (פנים), they [the living creatures — my note] are dismayed; when you take away their breath (רוח), they die and return to their dust. You send forth your spirit (רוח), they are created; and you renew the face (פנים) of the ground. Let the glory (כבוד) of the Lord (Yahweh) endure forever».

[13] TDOT. Vol. 1. 165. On page 161, Aalen has the following remark: «The situation is the same when the OT speaks of 'the light of Yahweh' (Isa 2:5), 'his (God's) light' or 'lamp' (Job 29:3), or in the same sense, of 'the light' (Ps 36:10[9]; 43:3). Here too light is to be understood as a symbol not of God's person, but of the salvation which God gives».

[14] The punitive function, for example, is closely connected to the concept of salvation, as long as Yahweh himself is the agent of salvation, and the liberation from the enemies' oppression implies a salvific act. Seeing his glory, the enemies «enter into the rock, and hide in the dust from the terror of the Lord (Yahweh), and from the glory (הדר) of His majesty (גאון)» [Isa 2:10]. The same expression, «the terror of the Lord (Yahweh) and from the glory (הדר) of His majesty (גאון)», occurs at 2:19 and 2:21. The same theme, though differently expressed, appears in 10:16–18; 19:1;

The evidence above suggests that the connection between salvation and the vision of the divine glory has a venerable history, being probably conveyed as early as the time of the First Temple. In addition, some texts pertaining to the Second Temple period such as Isaiah 33 and Psalm 68 seem to illustrate the connection between these two ideas and particular Jewish festivals.

At the same time, special attention should be paid to the original location of the divine *kabod* and its spatial movements. Salvation appears to involve a particular movement from the original location of divine glory to the new location of its manifestation, specifically to the place where the glory enacts its salvific operations. The old Hebrew references appear to be divided into two traditions. First, some texts such as Isaiah 2:3–5 and Ezekiel 1, 8, or 10 seem to talk about a terrestrial location, the Temple of Jerusalem or the river Chebar. At least for Isaiah, however, it is more plausible to conceive the divine manifestation of the *kabod* as a descent rather than a horizontal movement, because the Temple is placed on a mountain.[15] A second tradition seems to be quite clear in representing the divine *kabod* as descended from above. The narrative about the consecration of Solomon's temple may be a good example of this tradition:

> When Solomon had ended his prayer, fire came down from heaven (האש ירדה מהשמים, τὸ πῦρ κατέβη ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) and consumed the burned offering and the sacrifices; and the glory (כבוד, δόξα) of the Lord filled the temple. The priests could not enter the house of the Lord, because the glory (כבוד, δόξα) of the Lord filled the Lord's house. When all the people of Israel saw the fire come down and the glory (כבוד, δόξα) of the Lord on the temple, they bowed down on the pavement with their faces to the ground, and worshiped and gave thanks to the Lord.[16]

2. The Second Temple Passover and the Expectation of the Divine Light

A significant question can be raised about the time when the two ideas of the vision of divine light and salvation started being associated with the festival of Pesach. Several of the books ascribed to Philo of Alexandria seem to support the hypothesis that the connection was already functional at the time

26:21; 28:5; 31:7, 30; 33:2,3,6,11–12. As the psalm 104:1 shows, the terms of הוד (splendor) and הדר (glory, majesty) seem to refer to Yahweh's garments.

[15] See also Deut 33:2: «Lord came from Sinai, and dawned from Seir upon us; he shone forth from Mont Paran».

[16] 2 Chr 7: 1–3. Likewise, in the paradigmatic theophany on Mount Sinai, Moses sees Yahweh descending on the mount in order to disclose the divine commandments. See Exod 19:11: «the Lord will come down (ירד, καταβήσεται) upon Mount Sinai in the sight of all the people»; 34:5: «The Lord descended (ירד, κατέβη) in the cloud and stood with him there, and proclaimed the name, 'The Lord'».

of the Second Temple. In the second part of his *De specialibus legibus*, while describing the «ten feasts which are recorded in the law»,[17] Philo explains why Pascha falls on the fifteenth day of the first month. At that time light is an uninterrupted phenomenon of two days, the sun enlightening all the day of the fourteenth and the moon all the night of the fifteenth (i.e., in our modern calendar the day of 14th and the night of 14th to 15th):

> The feast begins at the middle of the month, on the fifteenth day, when the moon is full, a day purposely chosen because then there is no darkness, but everything is continuously lighted up (φωτὸς ἀνάπλεα πάντα διὰ πάντων) as the sun shines from morning to evening and the moon from evening to morning and while the stars give place to each other no shadow is cast upon their brightness (φέγγος).[18]

The element of light was therefore an important part of the feast. Nevertheless, light was not only a physical or cosmological event, but also one pertaining to the spiritual domain, and the first part of the treatise *Questions and Answers on Exodus* is of significant help in showing this idea. This treatise contains a commentary on Exodus 12, which represents the foundational biblical passage for Philo's commentaries on Passover, as well as for the «rabbinic» targums and early Christian Paschal homilies. In its core narrative, the passage reads as follows:

> The Lord (יהוה) said to Moses and Aaron in the Land of Egypt: This month shall mark for you the beginning of months; it shall be the first month of the year for you. Tell the whole congregation of Israel that on the tenth of this month they are to take a lamb for each family, a lamb for each household. [...] You shall keep it until the fourteenth day of this month; then the whole assembled congregation of Israel shall slaughter it at twilight. They shall take some of the blood and put it on the two doorposts and the lintel of the houses in which they eat it. They shall eat the lamb that same night; [...] It is the Passover (פסח) of the Lord (יהוה). For I will pass through the land of Egypt that night. [...] I am the Lord (אני יהוה). [...] This day shall be a day of remembrance for you. You shall celebrate it as a festival (חג) to the Lord (יהוה).[19]

One can easily understand from this fragment the basic facts of the paschal story: Yahweh lets Moses and Aaron know about his coming and asks them to further inform the people of Israel to be prepared for such a crucial

[17] Philo, *Spec.* 2,41, in *Philo* VII (Trans. F. H. Colson (Cambridge, 1984) (LCL, 320)), 391: δέκα ἑορταί, ἃς ἀναγράφει ὁ νόμος.

[18] *Spec.* 2,155. Cf. *QE* 1,9: «(Exod 12:6a) Why does He command (them) to keep the sacrifice until the fourteenth (day of the month)? [...] For when it has become full on the fourteenth (day), it becomes full of light in the perception of the people». (*Philo*. Supplement II (Trans. R. Marcus (Cambridge, 1987) (LCL, 401) 17).

[19] Exod 12:1–14.

encounter with his God. They must keep aside a chosen lamb for a period of four days and slaughter it afterwards in the twilight of the fourth day; Yahweh will come that night. A particular aspect that needs to be underlined is the tension of the high, if not the highest possible, expectation, namely that of God's coming. Due perhaps to its central importance, both the Pesach and Paschal festivals will preserve this tension of expectation, as long as a similar feature may be encountered either in Christian homilies or in rabbinic materials. However, Philo's book may be viewed as a first treatise on the paschal tradition, the key difference from future Christian approaches being that he uses a spiritual rather than a typological reading. The Christian homilists will conceive a difference between the old and the new Pascha, using a typological interpretation, while Philo offers an allegorical interpretation and envisions Passover as the passage from the sensible to the intelligible realm, from the literal meaning (τὸ ῥητόν) of the text to its deeper sense according to reason (τὸ πρὸς διάνοιαν).[20] Every chapter is methodically articulated, starting with an initial, literal reading and continuing with a second reading, which is an intelligible, allegorical, or dianoetical explanation. At this second level, the Passover represents the progress (προκοπή) of the soul, and most likely its culmination consists of reaching illumination:[21]

> For when the souls appear bright and visible, their visions begin to hold festival, hoping for a life without sorrow or fear as their lot and seeing the cosmos with the weight of the understanding as full and perfect, in harmony with the decade.[22]

A passage from *De congressu quaerendae eruditionis gratia* summarizes the articulation of all these key ideas of Passover, progress of the soul, and illumination:

> We find this «ten» plainly stated in the story of the soul's Passover, the crossing (διάβασις) from every passion and all the realm of sense to the tenth, which is the realm of mind and God; for we read «on the tenth day of this month let everyone take a sheep for his house» (Exod xii.3), and thus beginning with the tenth day we shall sanctify to Him that is tenth the offering fostered in the soul whose face have been illumined (πεφωτισμένη) through

[20] *QE* 1,4. The soul and the mind have to pass from the vicious function to the virtuous one, and ultimately the soul has to overcome the body, the mind has to overcome the senses, while the thoughts have to become prophetic. Cf. *Spec.* 2,147 where the opposite word for τὸ ῥητόν is ἀλληγορία, and Pascha regards the purification of the soul.

[21] *QE* 1,3; 1,7; and 1,11.

[22] *QE* 1,2 (Trans. R. Marcus (LCL, 401) 8). The same perspective is also expressed a few pages further in the eighth chapter: «First it [the soul which desires perfection] was necessary to pluck out sins and then to wash them out and, being resplendent, to complete the daily (tasks) in the practice of virtue». (*QE* 1,8; MARCUS, 17).

> two parts out of three, until its whole being becomes a brightness (φέγγος), giving light to the heaven like a full moon by its increase in the second week. And thus it will be able not only to keep safe, but to offer as innocent and spotless victims its advances on the path of progress (προκοπαί).[23]

Thus, envisioning the Paschal festival as the progress (προκοπή) of the soul on the way toward illumination or meeting God, the Philonian passages illustrate that the expectation of the Paschal enlightenment was a lively practice during the Second Temple period. In addition, it is also important to note that Philo concocted the whole visionary argument in an internalized form, namely as the progress of the soul. The internalized way to illumination parallels the cosmic growth of the moon from two-thirds on the tenth day of Nissan to the full moon on the fourteenth. Thus, the Alexandrian depicts the dynamic of the spiritual advancement and of the gradual illumination of the soul to the completion of its entire brightness (φέγγος) in the context of the Passover festival.[24] This dynamic will also be present, in a different form, in Melito and Pseudo-Hippolytus.

3. The Mediation of the New Testament: Identifying Christ with the Divine Kabod

The central distinction between the Jewish Pesach and the Christian Pascha is primarily a matter of theology, consisting of the Christian identification of Yahweh or of the divine *kabod* with Jesus Christ. This process is already present in the Christian documents of the first century pertaining to the New Testament, and some scholars consider it as originating within the religious or liturgical practice of the first Christian century.[25] The theological position ascribing a divine or godly nature to Jesus Christ is usually called «high Christology».

The process of identifying Jesus Christ with Yahweh can be encountered, for example, in 1 Corinthians 2:8, where Christ receives the title of the «Lord of glory» (Κύριος τῆς δόξης), one of Yahweh's Old Testament titles. Likewise, after the narrative of the events of Epiphany and Christ's temptations in the wilderness, Matthew 4:13–16 connects Christ's first kerygmatic actions to the salvific intervention of the divine light promised in Isaiah 9:1–2:

---

[23] Philo, *Congr.* 106, in *Philo IV* (Trans. F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker (Cambridge, 1985) (LCL, 261) 511).

[24] For the theme of progressive illumination of the soul in Philo, see also *Spec.* 2,145–149 and *QE* 1, 7–8.

[25] See, for example, L. Hurtado, One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism (London—New York, 1998), or idem, Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity (Grand Rapids, 2003) and R. Bauckham, God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament (Grand Rapids, 1998).

> He left Nazareth and made his home in Capernaum by the sea, in the territory of Zebulun and Nephtali, so that what had been spoken through the prophet Isaiah might be fulfilled: «Land of Zebulun, land of Nephtali, on the road by the sea, across the Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles — the people who set in darkness have seen a great light, and for those who set in the region and shadow of death light has dawned».

Matthew 1:22–23 also identifies the newborn Christ with the character of the newborn Emmanuel found in Isaiah 7:14. In addition, in the narrative about the presentation in the Temple in Luke 2:28–32, Simeon, the old man who receives Christ in his hands, pronounces the following oracle: «My eyes have seen your salvation which you have prepared before the face of all peoples, a light (φῶς) for revelation to the nations, and the glory (δόξα) of your people Israel».[26]

Also important for this investigation is the fact that the Gospel according to John depicts the event of the Incarnation as the coming of the divine light, therefore using glory-terminology. After identifying in 1:4 the Word with «life» and «life» with «light», in a similar fashion to the *Targum Neofiti 1*, the Gospel states in 1:9 that «[t]he true light, which enlightens everyone, was coming into the world». Besides this, while in 1:14 the apostle testifies that disciples have seen Christ's glory (δόξα), in 8:12, 9:5 and 12:35–36,46 gives witness that Christ defines himself as the light of the world (τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου), or the light that came into the world. The glory-language which depicts Christ's Incarnation as the descent of the divine *kabod* was therefore commonplace as early as the first century AD, and the soteriological intention of this coming was an integrated element.

Finally, the Book of Revelation does not associate the salvific glory with the event of Incarnation but with the eschatological reality of the heavenly kingdom. Thus, 21:23–24 states that «the city has no need of sun or moon to shine on it, for the glory of God is its light, and its lamp is the Lamb. The nations will walk by its light, and the kings of the earth will bring their glory into it». Consequently, salvation comes through the divine *kabod* and the state of salvation is conceived of as existing within the glory of God. Likewise, the distinctive element of the Christian glory-soteriology consists of the identifying Jesus Christ with the *kabod*.

4. Glory-Soteriology at the Paschal Festivals of Asia Minor

Christian paschal theology will apropriate the identification between Jesus Christ and the divine *kabod* and will develop it as one of its central tenets. The Melitonean *Peri Pascha* together with the anonymous paschal homily entitled *In sanctum Pascha* probably represent the most ancient Christian

[26] I am indebted for this idea to Fr. Alexander Golitzin.

paschal texts.[27] According to several scholars, *1 Peter* and the *Epistle of Barnabas* appear to be good candidates as well.[28] However, the two paschal homilies associate the festival of Pascha with the descent of the heavenly Christ as glory (δόξα). Sometime between A.D. 169 and 177, Melito, bishop of Sardis, was the petitioner of an apology to the emperor Marcus Aurelius on behalf of his fellow Christians. Although the apology has been lost, this event helps modern scholars to locate the activity of the Sardisian bishop in the second century A.D.[29] In his only extant book, *Peri Pascha*, Melito utters:

> [T]he temple below was precious, but it is worthless now because of the Christ above. The Jerusalem below was precious, but it is worthless now because of the Jerusalem above [...] For it is not in one place (τόπος) nor in a little plot that the glory (δόξα) of God is established (literally «enthroned», καθίδρυται), but on all the ends of the inhabited earth his bounty overflows, and there the almighty God has made his dwelling (κατεσκήνωκεν) through Christ Jesus.[30]

This fragment recalls the text of Revelation 21, which gives a picture of the heavenly Jerusalem descending to earth. The difference primarily consists of the fact that Christ's divine descent as glory is not temporally situated at the end of time, but in a well-specified present time, «now» (νῦν — emphatically repeated in the previous verses), which most likely refers to the paschal celebration when the homilist declaims his oeuvre. Furthermore, the divine *kabod*, usually depicted as sitting on the divine throne, appears in the homily as enthroned on the entire earth and overflowing earth's boundaries. It is also noteworthy that Melito articulates his discourse on Pascha in terms and images related to the descent and terrestrial activity of the Lord, first within the events of the Old Testament, which are the types of the events of the New Testaments, and then in terms and images related to the Incarnation, Passion, and salvation:

> It is he who, coming from heaven to the earth because of the suffering one, and clothing himself in that same one through a virgin's womb, and coming forth a man, accepted the passions of the suffering one through the

[27] See R. Cantalamessa, I piu antichi testi pasquali della Chiesa. Le omelie di Melitone di Sardi e dell'Anonimo Quartodecimano e altri testi de II secolo. Introduzione, traduzione e commentario (Rome, 1972).

[28] See the hypothesis that L. W. Barnard proposed in his The Epistle of Barnabas — A Paschal Homily? // *VC* 15 (1961) 8–22, as well as that from F. L. Cross, I Peter, A Paschal Liturgy? (London, 1954).

[29] S. G. Hall, introduction to *Melito of Sardis*, On Pascha and Fragments / Trans. S. G. Hall (Oxford, 1979) xii and xv.

[30] Melito of Sardis, *Peri Pascha* [*PP*] 44–45 // Ibid. 23. The present study follows this critical edition.

> body which was able to suffer, and dissolved the passions of the flesh; and by the Spirit which could not die he killed death the killer of men.[31]

In a different passage, which is almost identical with the saying found in *Mishnah Pesachim* 10,5, Melito also projects the ideas of light and salvation on the Paschal event:

> It is he that delivered us from slavery to liberty, from darkness to light, from death to life, from tyranny to eternal royalty, and made us a new priesthood and an eternal people personal to him. He is the Pascha of our salvation.[32]

The other paschal document, *In sanctum Pascha*, begins with the following words:

> Now is it the time when the light of Christ sheds its rays;[33] the pure rays (φωστῆρες) of the pure Spirit rise and the heavenly treasures of divine glory (δόξα) are opened up. Night's darkness and obscurity have been swallowed up, and the dense blackness dispersed in this light of day; crabbed death has been totally eclipsed. Life has been extended (ἐφηπλώθη) to every creature and all things are diffused in brightness (φῶς). The dawn of dawn ascends over the earth (ἀνατολαὶ ἀνατολῶν ἐπέχουσι τὸ πᾶν)[34] and he who was before the morning star and before the other stars, the mighty (μέγας) Christ, immortal and mighty (πολύς), sheds light brighter than the sun on the universe.[35]

The document is an anonymous homily of Greek language that has survived over the centuries among the manuscripts ascribed to two widely known

---

[31] *PP* 66 [451–458]; cf. 46–47 [303–310].

[32] Melito of Sardis, *PP* 68 [473–480]. In one of his articles, S.G. Hall studied this Melitonian passage in parallel with two Jewish texts, namely *Mishnah Pesachim* 10,5 and *Exodus Rabbah* 12,2 (cf. S. G. Hall, Melito in the Light of the Passover Haggadah // *JTS* n.s. 22 (1971) 29–46).

[33] Halton's expression «the blessed light of Christ sheds its rays» might be changed into «the light of Christ sheds its sacred rays», according to ἱεραὶ μὲν ἤδη φωτὸς αὐγάζουσι Χριστοῦ ἀκτῖνες. Compare my proposal with Nautin's solution («les rayons sacrés de la lumière du Christ resplendissent» — Homélies Pascales / Ed. P. Nautin (Paris, 1950) (SC, 27) 116) and that offered by Visonà: «brillano i sacri raggi della luce di Cristo» (G. Visonà, *Pseudo Ippolito*, In sanctum Pascha / Studio, edizione, commento (Milano, 1988) 231). For the Greek text, the present study follows Pierre Nautin's edition, Homélies Pascales… 170 (*In sanctum Pascha* [*IP*] 1,1). Cf. Visonà, Pseudo Ippolito...

[34] For the economy of the present study, it would be significant to mention that Nautin translated the Greek noun τὸ πᾶν through «l'univers» (Homélies Pascales… 116), while Visonà rendered it through «l'universo» (Visonà, 231).

[35] A. Hamman (ed.), The Paschal Mystery. Ancient Liturgies and Patristic Texts / Trans. T. Halton (Staten Iland, 1969) 50. Cf. Homélies Pascales… 170.

Christian theologians: Hippolytus of Rome and John Chrysostom. Modern scholars started to raise questions about the authorship of this document as early as the nineteenth century when the homily's setting in Migne's collection was among the Chrysostomian *dubia*. However, there is not a consensus among scholars regarding the time when this text appeared.[36]

Ps-Hippolitus speaks more clearly about the descent of the divine light at the time of the Paschal celebration. In fact, as the homilist states in the opening phrase of the hymn, the Pascal night is the moment of Christ's coming (ἐπιδημία), when the border between heaven and earth is removed and the divine grace stored in heaven probably from the first day of creation, floods the whole universe: «the heavenly treasures of the divine glory (δόξα) are opened up».[37] The light of the glory (δόξα) of Christ, which illumines the heavenly Jerusalem in the Revelation 21, is now spread over the entire cosmos: «...the blessed light of Christ sheds its rays [...] the mighty Christ, immortal and mighty, sheds light brighter than the sun on the universe (τὸ πᾶν)».[38]

---

[36] While C. Martin — in his Un Περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα de S. Hippolyte retrouvé? // *Recherches de science religieuse* 16 (1922) 148–165 — thought that the homily might be the lost Hippolytan *On Pascha*, M. Richard considered it monarchianist : Une homélie monarchienne sur la Pâque // *SP* III.78 (1961) 284. In his introduction to Homélies Paschales... 46–48, P. Nautin presumed that the homily might have been composed in the fourth century CE. On the contrary, R. Cantalamessa pointed to an author from the Asia Minor of the end of the second century: L'Omelia «In S. Pascha» dello Pseudo-Ippolito di Roma. Ricerche sulla teologia dell'Asia Minore nella seconda meta del II secolo (Milano, 1967) 187–368. On the one hand, Gribomont, Stuiber, and Visonà acted with prudence in dating the homily: J. Gribomont // *RSLR* 5 (1969) 158–163; A. Stuiber // *Theologische Revue* 66 (1970) 398; Visonà, Pseudo-Ippolito... 35–36. On the other hand, Botte, Daniélou, Grillmeier, Simonetti, Hall, Richardson, Mara, Blanchetière, and Mazza embraced Cantalamessa's position, and Kretschmar considered that the homily is a document resonating with the beginning of the third century. See B. Botte // *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 33 (1968) 184; J. Daniélou // *RSR* 57 (1969) 79–84; A. Grillmeier // *Theologie und Philosophie* 44 (1969) 128–130; M. Simonetti // *Vetera Christianorum* 6 (1969) 218–220; S. G. Hall // *JTS* 20 (1969) 301–304; G. Kretschmar, Christliches Passa im 2. Jahrhundert und die Ausbildung der christlichen Theologie // *RSR* 60 (1972) 306–307; C. C. Richardson, A New Solution to the Quartodeciman and the Synoptic Chronology // *JTS* 24 (1973) 77; M. G. Mara, Évangile de Pierre (Paris, 1973) (SC) 215; F. Blanchetière, Le christianisme asiate aux II[e] et III[e] siècles (Lille, 1981) 185; E. Mazza, Omelie pasquali e birkat ha-mazon: fonti dell'anafora di Ippolito? // *EL* 97 (1983) 409–481. Finally, in the most recent investigation, Gerlach maintains that *IP* should be associated with the Paschal tradition conveyed in third century Asia Minor. K. Gerlach, The Antenicene Pascha. A Rhetorical History (Leuven, 1998) 161, 387, 403.

[37] Hamman, The Paschal Mystery... 50. *IP* 1,1.

[38] Ibid.

Pseudo-Hippolytus also uses the languages of the Incarnation to describe the Pascha, and depicts this moment as the descent of divine glory.[39] Hence, expressed in the same glory-language, Pascha does not seem to be a very different sort of event than that of the Incarnation. Furthermore, the Paschal expectation of the divine *kabod* has also been closely connected to, or even identical with, the expectation of the Parousia. For example, Tertullian affirms that the event of Parousia will likely occur during the celebration of Pentecost.[40] While the *Epistula Apostolorum* 17 places the same eschatological event between the Pentecost and the festival of Azymes, the Vatican codex of the *Gospel of the Hebrews* reads that the final judgment will take place during the eight paschal days.[41] However, two of the most significant testimonies of the Paschal expectation are preserved in Lactance and Jerome. Lactance, in his *Divinae institutiones* 7.19.3, written after A.D. 313, states that Christians celebrate the paschal night by a vigil because of the coming (*adventum*) of the king and God.[42] In a similar, although more obvious way, Jerome affirms in his *Commentary on Matthew* 4.25.6 that, according to a Jewish tradition, Christ will come during the night of Pascha as the Lord came in Egypt, following the angel of death during the night. This particular expectation seems to be, according to Jerome, the theological reason for the «apostolic tradition» of not dismissing the community before the midnight of the Paschal celebration.

5. Rabbinic Expectations of the Divine Light at the Passover Night

One of the Mishnahic sayings ascribed to Rabbi Gamaliel, a saying later taken over into the final prayer of the Haggadah for Pesach, depicts the Passover as a passage from darkness to light and from servitude to salvation:

> He brought us forth from slavery to freedom, from sorrow to joy, from mourning to festivity, from darkness to great light, and from servitude to redemption![43]

[39] For him, the Incarnation was both a coming (ἐπιδημία, *IP* 43–44) of Christ, who is the eternal priest, the King of glory, and the Lord of the powers (*IP* 46), and a compression of the magnitude of divinity in a human form (*IP* 45).

[40] *De baptismo* 19.2.

[41] Cod. Vat. Reg. Lat. 49, from R. Cantalamessa, La Pâque dans l'Eglise ancienne (Berne, 1980) 30.

[42] *Haec est nox quae a nobis propter adventum regis ac dei nostri pervigilio celebratur* (Ed. S. Brandt (Praga—Wien—Leipzig, 1890) (CSEL, 19) 645).

[43] *Mishnah Pesachim* X, 5 // The Mishnah: Seder Moed / Ed. N. Scherman, M. Zlotowitz. Vol. II (Brooklyn, NY, 1985) 217. Cf. E. D. Goldschmidt, The Passover Haggadah: Its Sources and History (Jerusalem, 1960). See also *Mishnah*, *Exodus Rabbah* 12:2.

In its turn *Codex Neofiti 1*, makes obvious the expectation of divine glory during the night of Passover. Exodus 12:23 («For the Lord will pass through to strike down the Egyptians…») appears in the Targum in the following form:

> And the Glory of the Shekinah of the Lord (איקר שבינתיא דיי) will pass to blot out the Egyptians; and he will see the blood upon the lintel and upon the two doorposts and he will pass by, and the *Memra* of the Lord (מימריה דיי) will defend the door of the fathers of the children of Israel.[44]

It is significant to note how the text brings into the paschal play a new character, the *Memra* (מימר) or the Word of Yahweh. It is also worth noting the change of Exodus 12:12–13 from the biblical «For I will pass through the land of Egypt that night … I am the Lord… [W]hen I see the blood, I will pass over you» to the targumic «I will pass in my *Memra* (מימר) through the land of Egypt this night of the Passover … I in my *Memra* will defend you».[45] It appears that, for the targumic writer, the divine agent that is manifest or acting within the world is not Yahweh any more, but the Word of Yahweh, or Yahweh through his Word.

For the purpose of the present study it is also significant that the targumic fragment corresponding to Exodus 12:42 identifies the Word (*Memra*) with the Light of the first day of creation.[46] Hence, the whole targumic passage summarizes Yahweh's gradual manifestation within the history of the world:

> The *first night*: when the Lord was revealed over the world to create it. The world was without form and void, and darkness was spread over the face of the abyss and the Memra of the Lord (ממריה דיי) was the Light (נהורא), and it shone; and he called it the *First Night*. The *second night*: when the Lord was revealed to Abram … The *third night*: when the Lord

[44] *Tg. Neof.* 12:23, in M. McNamara, R. Hayward, Targum Neofiti 1: Exodus (The Aramaic Bible. The Targums. Vol. 2) (Collegeville, 1994) 49. For the Aramaic text, see A. D. Macho, Neophiti 1. Targum Palestinense Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana (Tomo II Exodo) / Trans. M. McNamara, M. Maher (Madrid—Barcelona, 1970), 439. See also M. Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature (New York, 1950) 775: מימר, מאמר, or מימרא = «word, command». Likewise, שבינה, שבינתא, or שבינתי in some editions means «royal residence, royalty, glory, divine glory». (Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim... 1573).

[45] *Tg. Neof.* 12:12–13, in McNamara, Hayward, Targum Neofiti 1… 47–48, and Macho, Neophiti 1… 437.

[46] Corroborating this text with Jn 1:4–9 (esp. 9) and *IP* 1,1, one may find that Christian and Jewish communities developed various speculations about the divine light of the first day of creation and its presence within the created universe. These speculations may further be connected with the later Byzantine interest for the uncreated energies or grace and their manifestations within the creation.

> was revealed against the Egyptians at midnight: his hand slew the first-born of the Egyptians and his right hand protected the first-born of Israel … The *fourth night*: When the world reaches its appointed time to be redeemed: the iron yokes shall be broken [cf. Isa 9:4; 10:27 etc. and Jer 28:2–14], and the generations of wickedness shall be blotted out, and Moses will go up from the desert <and the king Messiah [מל כא משיחא] from the midst of Rome>. […] and his *Memra* (מימר) will lead between the two of them, and I and they will proceed together. This is the night of the Passover to the name of the Lord [cf. Ex 12:11]; it is a night reserved and set aside for the redemption of all Israel, throughout their generations.[47]

The passage thus depicts Yahweh's economy, if one can use this Greek term expressing God's manifestation in the world, a manifestation expressly guided by a soteriological goal. All the four manifestations of God in four different nights reflect the gradual illumination of creation accomplished in the final appearance of the Word at the Eschaton, when he will come in the company of Moses and the Messiah. While the Word is identified at the beginning of the fragment with the light of the first day of creation, at the end of the world the Word will reveal himself during the night of the Passover. As a consequence, it seems that the *Targum Neofiti 1* preserves a special tradition in which the end of the actual world and the beginning of the eschatological one will happen on a Paschal night.[48]

In a different manner, yet emphasizing the same conception as that of *Neofiti 1*, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* on Exodus changes Exodus 12:11–12 («and you shall eat it [the lamb] hurriedly. It is the Passover of the Lord. For I will pass through the land of Egypt that night») to the following:

> And you shall eat in the *haste* of the Shekinah (שכינת) of the Lord of the world, because it is a mercy from before the Lord for you. On that night I will be revealed in the land of Egypt in the Shekinah (שכינת) of my Glory (יקרי), and with me there will be ninety thousand myriads of destroying angels.[49]

---

[47] *Tg. Neof.* 12:42, in McNamara, Hayward, Targum Neofiti 1… 52–53; Macho, Neophiti 1… 441–442. It is worth mentioning that, in Macho's edition, McNamara preferred to translate מן גו רומא through «from on high» instead of «from the midst of Rome». He is in agreement with Macho's «de lo alto» (Macho, Neophiti 1… 78) and Le Déaut's «d'en-haut» (Ibid. 313). See also the classical study on the theme of the four nights, Le Déaut, La nuit pascale…

[48] Compare with the Christian documents mentioned above. Cf. Hippolytus, *Comm. Dan* 4, 55ff.

[49] *Tg. Ps-J.* 12:11–12, in M. Maher, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodos (The Aramaic Bible. The Targums. Vol. 2) (Collegeville, 1994) 191. Cf. J. W. Etheridge, The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum (New York, 1968), 457. Also, see manuscript *Add. 27031* of *Tg. Ps-J.* from the British Museum in R. Le Déaut, Targum du Pentateuque (Tome II.

Once again, glory-language finds its place in the paschal discourse. Also, in 12:23, the glory (יקרא) is the agent which strikes the Egyptians, while the «*Memra* (מימרא) of the Lord will protect the door and will not allow the Destroying Angel to enter and smite your houses».[50] However, the passage does not make clear whether it is the glory or the destroying angel that strikes the Egyptian first-born. Finally, Exodus 12:29 introduces a third destroying agent, the Word of Yahweh: «In the middle of the night of the fifteenth (of Nissan) the *Memra* (מימרא) of the Lord slew all the first-born in the land of Egypt».[51] It is significant to note that, since the *Babilonian Targum* does not employ glory-language when discussing the Passover, it follows that glory-language reflects a Palestinian development.

As a partial conclusion, one might therefore suppose that certain rabbinic writings associate the festival of Pesach with the expectation of a salvific theophany, be it that of Yahweh, that of his Word or Light, or that of his *Shekinah*.

6. Conclusion

Documentary evidence seems to lead to the hypothesis that the divine salvific glory was an emblematic expectation in Passover ritual traditions of the Second Temple of Jerusalem and both rabbinic and Christian Paschal traditions preserved it as a [or possibly even the] central assumption of their theologies. Moreover, at least for the Christian and rabbinic traditions, the Festival of Pascha was the privileged time for the divine descent and manifestation. Thus, the present study proposes the model of a two-branched theological tradition — *kabod*/glory-soteriology — developed from a common trunk. While this trunk points to the shared use of words such as «glory», «light», or «Lord», the Christian communities make a radical semantic shift at the level of theory and worship by identifying Christ with the divine agent that comes in glory (i.e., Yahweh, *Shekinah*, or the Word of Yahweh). This shift may have occurred earlier than A.D. 70 (or, at least at some point within

Exode et Lévitique) (Paris, 1979) (SC, 256) 87). For the Aramaic text, see M. Ginsburger, Pseudo-Jonathan. Thargum Jonathan ben Usiël zum Pentateuch (Berlin, 1903) or D. Rieder, Pseudo-Jonathan: Targum Jonathan ben Uziel on the Pentateuch Copied from the London MS [British Museum Add. 27031] (Jerusalem, 1974) and E. G. Clarke, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance (Hoboken, New Jersey, 1984). For יקרא, יקירו, or יקרי, which means «honor, dignity», see Jastrow, A Dictionary… 592.

[50] *Tg. Ps-J.* 12:23, in Maher, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan… 192; cf. Etheridge, The Targums… 476–477.

[51] *Tg. Ps-J.* 12:29, in Maher, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan… 193; cf. Etheridge, The Targums… 447. It is worth mentioning that the destroying agent in *Tg. Onq.* and *Tg. Neof.*, in accordance with the biblical Ex 12:29, is Yahweh.

the first century), since several early Christian texts identify Christ with Yahweh or the Lord of Glory, one of Yahweh's Old Testament titles.

From a mystical perspective, all three forms of the Paschal festival (Second Temple, Christian, and rabbinic) reflect the expectation to see God and be saved, which perhaps is the most important goal of every form of mysticism. A noteworthy feature of the Paschal festival is that the practical method of this form of mysticism is one performed by a group or community, not by an isolated individual. Some ritual acts such as the repentance pertaining to the Day of Atonement, or the Jewish and Christian fasting periods, the Paschal vigil, and the whole Paschal ritual of gestures, hymns, and homilies seem to play a similar role as the ascetic exercises: they prepare the individual for the divine vision of the *kabod*. However, it seems that the Paschal celebration is a form of group-mysticism, and it does not seem to be unique. The liturgical celebration of the Sabbath Sacrifice in the community of Qumran might be also seen as a type of group-mysticism. Likewise, the Christian liturgy, as one can see in many scholarly investigations, may also be regarded as a form of community-oriented mysticism.[52]

[52] See, for instance, L. Schiffman, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of Jewish Liturgy // The Synagogue in Late Antiquity / Ed. L. A. Levine (Philadelphia, 1984) 33–48; C. Newsom, Songs of the Sabath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition (Atlanta, 1985); M. Barker, The Gate of Heaven: The History and Symbolism of the Temple in Jerusalem (London, 1991); S. Reif, Judaism and Hebrew Prayer: New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History (Cambridge, 1993); D. K. Falk, Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea scrolls (Leiden—Boston, 1998); A. Golitzin, Liturgy and Mysticism: The Experience of God in Eastern Orthodox Christianity // *Pro Ecclesia* VIII.1 (1999) 159–186; see also Golitzin's idea that the angelic hierarchy is a mirror and shaper of the soul in A. Golitzin, Dionysius Areopagites in the Works of Saint Gregory Palamas: On the Question of a «Christological Corrective» and Related Matters // *SVTQ* 46.2/3 (2002) 163–190; D. K. Falk, F. García-Martínez, E. M. Schuller (eds.), Sapiential, Liturgical, and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998. Published in memory of Maurice Baillet (Leiden—Boston, 2000); M. Barker, The Revelation of Jesus Christ: Which God Gave to Him to Show to His Servants what Must Soon Take Place [Revelation I.I] (Edinburgh, 2000) Esp. «Excursus: Parousia and Liturgy», 373–388; C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory of Adam. Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls (Leiden, 2002); G. Schimanowski, Die himmlische Liturgie in der Apokalypse des Johannes: die frühjüdischen Traditionen in Offenbarung 4–5 unter Einschluss der Hekhalotliteratur (Tübingen, 2002); M. Barker, The Great High Priest: The Temple Roots of Christian Liturgy (Edinburgh, 2003); The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001 / Ed. J. R. Davila (Leiden—Boston, 2003); R. Elior, The Three Temples: On the Emergence of Jewish Mysticism (Oxford—Portland, 2004).

Based on the assumptions of this study, several conclusions may be drawn. First, regarding the roots of glory-soteriology, it seems that a tradition that ascribed salvific power to the divine *kabod* existed in Second Temple Judaism and this position probably had its roots in the First Temple period. The main element of this theological position was that salvation comes through the manifestation of God's glory and consists of living before the divine Face.

Second, documents pertaining to the Second Temple period, such as Philo's writings, associate the vision of light with the Passover festival. One also may suppose that early rabbinic texts, such as *Mishnah Pesachim* and the Targums *Neofiti 1* and *Pseudo-Jonathan*, preserve a tradition originating within the Second Temple period.

Third, Christian authors, such as Melito and Pseudo-Hippolytus, point to the Christian expectation of divine light at the time of the Paschal festival. As an important innovation, a semantic import occurs within the old system of meanings: now, Yahweh's expected theophany is the second coming, or the Parousia, of the resurrected Christ.

Fourth, the Christian and rabbinic Paschal expectations of the descent of the divine light most probably constitute two separate developments of previously similar expectations at the Passover festival observed during the Second Temple period.

Finally, the Jewish and Christian Festivals of Pascha may be regarded as forms of a special sort of mysticism, liturgical and community-oriented in its nature, offering the hope of salvation for everyone, rather than being the privilege of special individuals.

ABSTRACT

Two of the oldest Christian Paschal homilies, one by Melito of Sardis and the other of unknown origin (preserved under the names of Hippolytus of Rome and John Chrysostom), testify to the expectation of the descent of the divine and salvific glory during the Paschal night. I would call the theological doctrine behind this liturgical practice glory-soteriology or *kabod*-soteriology. Rabbinic materials such as the targums *Neofiti 1* and *Pseudo-Jonathan* attest to a similar expectation on the night of the festival of Pesach. The salvific power of this glory seems to constitute the first rationale for this expectation, and the Festival of Pascha the privileged time for the divine descent and manifestation. Since further investigation identifies similar elements in the writings of Philo of Alexandria, the present study proposes what might be called a «two-branched» theory: one might reasonably suppose that both the Christian and the Jewish-rabbinic expectations of the descent of the salvific glory of Pascha may constitute two different developments of a common matrix in the Second Temple festival of Passover. Major doctrinal and ritual shifts emerge in Christian worship where Jesus Christ took the place of Yahweh or of his Word.

Hieromonk Alexander (Golitzin)

«THE DEMONS SUGGEST AN ILLUSION OF GOD'S GLORY IN A FORM»: CONTROVERSY OVER THE DIVINE BODY AND VISION OF GLORY IN SOME LATE FOURTH, EARLY FIFTH CENTURY MONASTIC LITERATURE

I. A Little Noticed Controversy with Broader Implications

The monk, John Cassian, the bishop, Palladius of Heliopolis, and the Church historians, Socrates and Sozomen, all agree that the Archbishop Theophilus of Alexandria's pascal letter of late winter, 399, hit a nerve among the monks of Egypt.[1] Theophilus had taken the occasion to condemn at length the teaching that God has a human form, and it was this condemnation which drew an army of angry monks to his doors looking to string him up from the nearest lamppost. Socrates and Sozomen go on tell how the cunning prelate averted death by telling the monks that, in them, «I behold the face of God», and then used their anger to begin a purge of monastic figures he had targeted well before: the disciples of Origen.[2]

Perhaps because Theophilus' letter is no longer extant, and because the four ancient reporters I just listed were all in theological (though not political) sympathy with his position on the issue, there has been very little scholarly literature devoted to this incident, and none whatever to the possibility that it represented but one example of a much wider, contemporary phenomenon.[3] Most moderns have shared my ancient reporters' disdain for the pro-

[1] See John Cassian, *Collatio X*, in *Collationes* (Ed. M. Petschenig (CSEL, 13) 288–308; ET: John Cassian, *The Conferences* / Tr. O. Chadwick (New York, 1985) 125–140; Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica* VI.7 // *PG* 67. 684A–688C; ET: NPNF, 2nd Series, II. 142–143; Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica* VIII.1–12 // *PG* 70. 1344C–1349A; ET: NPNF, 2nd Series, II. 406–407; Palladius, *Dialogue sur la vie de saint Jean Chrysostome* / Ed. Malingrey, P. LeClerc (Paris, 1988) (SC, 341) 138–140.

[2] Socrates, *HE* 684BC, and Sozomen, *HE* 1545A, both quote Theophilus as telling the monks that he sees them ὡς θεοῦ πρόσωπον. The ensuing campaign against the monastic followers of Origen is covered in detail by E. Clark, The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate (Princeton, 1992), if, as the title indicates, chiefly from a sociological perspective.

[3] E. Drioton was the first to write on this controversy in La discussion d'un moine anthropomorphite audien avec le patriarche Théophile d'Alexandrie // *ROC* 20 (1915–

testing monks, who are as a result represented as espousing the sort of «crude forms of folk religion» that the enlightened normally expect from illiterate *fellahin*.[4] Then, too, there is the habit, nearly universal until recently and even now overcome only with difficulty, of projecting back into an earlier era the conceptual structures — in this case, the theology — of later periods. The theology in question here is that of post-Nicene, trinitarian orthodoxy, specifically as the latter had, on the one hand, just been confirmed by ecclesiastical authority by the Creed of Nicea-Constantinople in 381, and, on the other hand, enforced by the imperial authority of Theodosius I († 395) and his successors. For my purposes in this paper, the salient characteristic of the new, imperial orthodoxy was its implicit commitment to the place and even necessity of philosophical expression in the self-articulation of the Christian faith, a commitment summed up in the Nicene term, «consubstantial» (ὁμο-

1917) 92–100 and 113–128, providing the Coptic text and French translation of *The Life of Apa Aphou of Pemdje*, discussed in this paper below, and arguing for anthropomorphism as a new «heresy» imported into Egypt by the Syrian Audians. G. Florovsky, in «The Anthropomorphites of the Egyptian Desert», and at greater length in «Theophilus of Alexandria and Apa Aphou of Pemdje», both essays in The Collected Works of Father Georges Florovsky (Belmont, MA, 1975) Vol. IV. 89–96 and 97–129, resp., argued against Drioton that the «anthropomorphites» were neither Audians nor «heretics», but in fact orthodox defenders of the Incarnation who were slandered by their «Origenist» critics (i.e., Cassian, Palladius, Sozomen and Socrates), who provide — other than the *Life of Apa Aphou* — our sole witnesses to the controversy. G. Gould, The Image of God and the Anthropomorphite Controversy in Fourth Century Monasticism // Origeniana Quinta / Ed. B. Daley (Leuven, 1992) 549–557, seconded Florovsky's opinion, together with Clark, The Origenist Controversy… 43–84, who added speculation about possible pagan influences at work in the protesting monks. G. G. Stroumsa is unique in suggesting ties or at least correspondences with Jewish traditions of the divine image, at first as a concluding aside in The Incorporeality of God: Context and Implications of Origen's Position // *Religion* 13 (1983) 354, and then at greater length in Jewish and Gnostic Traditions among the Audians // Sharing the Sacred: Religious Contacts and Conflicts in the Holy Land / Ed. A. Kofsky, G. G. Stroumsa (Jerusalem, 1998) 345–358, though he follows Drioton — mistakenly, I think — in assuming that the anthropomorphism of the Egyptian monks is a Syrian import. See relatedly D. O. Paulsen, Early Christian Belief in a Corporeal Deity: Origen and Augustine as Reluctant Witnesses // *HTR* 83.2 (1990) 105–116, and idem, Reply to Kim Paffenroth's Comment // *HTR* 86.2 (1993) 235–239, esp. 237–239.

[4] I am quoting, a little unfairly, J. A. McGuckin on Cyril of Alexandria's anti-anthropomor-phite correspondence in St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy, Its History, Theology, and Texts (Leiden, 1994) 121. See also the similar remarks forty years earlier in H. Chadwick, commenting on Origen's treatise, *On Prayer*, in Alexandrian Christianity (Philadelphia, 1954) 194, 215, and esp. 355–356, together with L. R. Wickham, Cyril of Alexandria: Select Letters (Oxford, 1983) xxix–xxxi.

οὐσιος). While it is generally recognized that this new formulation of the Christian Trinity overthrew the earlier Logos Christology of the Apologists and Alexandrians, the fact that still older currents of tradition — currents which quite possibly the Logos theology itself had been intended to reformulate — were also similarly affected is not so recognized, aside from a very few and mostly unnoticed exceptions.[5]

II. Western and Eastern Christianity on the *Visio dei*: Some Differences in the Wake of Nicea

I would like to suggest that the angry monks of Egypt, together with Christian ascetics elsewhere in the Eastern Empire at the turn of the fifth century, were adherents of ancient traditions of the divine body and *visio gloriae*. The Nicene-Constantinopolitan settlement had, however, just made their views a theological anachronism. They were slow to realize this fact, so slow indeed that adjustments to the new doctrinal configuration continue to be reflected in monastic literature for decades to come and, in some places, even for centuries. With the exception of scholars such as Guy Stroumsa and Gilles Quispel, nowhere in scholarly literature is this long process at work in Eastern Christian ascetical literature even noticed, let alone examined in detail.[6] Gershom Scholem's *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* sixty years ago and other studies thereafter have over the past twenty years begun to have an extraordinarily fruitful effect on the study of a number of different areas of inquiry: apocalyptic literature, Qumran studies, Christian origins, and, most obviously, Rabbinic thought, but this revolution — save the exceptions just noted — has not yet begun to penetrate scholarly discussion of the Christian literature of the fourth and later centuries.[7] This may be because of a tendency among

[5] To this point on the *Logos* theology, see for example the discussion of Philo in A. F. Segal, Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism (Leiden, 1977) 159–181.

[6] See G. Quispel, Sein und Gestalt // Studies in Mysticism and Relgion Presented to Gershom G. Scholem (Jerusalem, 1967) 191–195; idem, Makarios, das Thomasevangelium, und das Lied von der Perle (Leiden, 1967) Esp. 49–64 on image and glory; and, more recently, idem, Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosticism // *VC* 34 (1980) 1–13; together with G. G. Stroumsa in several articles and at least one monograph, including: Jewish and Gnostic Traditions among the Audians…; idem, The Incorporeality of God… 354; and idem, Hidden Wisdom: Esoteric Traditions and the Roots of Christian Mysticism (Leiden, 1996) Esp. 27–62 and 109–131 on pre-Nicene Christian texts, and 132–167 on post-Nicene.

[7] G. G. Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (Jerusalem, 1941; repr. 1973); idem, Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and the Talmudic Tradition (New York, 1960); idem, On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in the Kabbalah / Tr. J. Neugroschel (New York, 1991) Esp. 15–37; The following is a

sampling of the literature on the several fields noted above which in whole or in part owes importantly to Scholem: I. Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkabah Mysticism (Leiden, 1980); idem, Manicheism and Judaism in Light of the Cologne Mani Codex // *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphie* 50 (1983) 29–45; I. Chernus, Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism (Berlin, 1982); J. Fossum, Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism // *VC* 37 (1983) 260–287; idem, The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord (Tübingen, 1985); idem, The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism in Early Christology (Göttingen, 1995); A. F. Segal, Two Powers in Heaven; idem, Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee (New Haven, 1990); J. J. Collins (ed.), Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre // *Semeia* 14 (1979); idem, The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity (New York, 1984); J. J. Collins, M. Fishbane (eds.), Death, Ecstasy, and Otherworldly Journeys (Albany, 1995); C. Rowland, The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature // *JSJ* 10.2 (1979) 137–154; idem, The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity (New York, 1984); idem, John 1:51, Jewish Apocalyptic and Targumic Tradition // *NTS* 30.3 (1984) 498–507; J. Tabor, Things Unutterable: Paul's Ascent to Heaven in its Greco-Roman, Judaic, and Early Christian Contexts (Lanham, 1986); P. Alexander, Comparing Merkabah Mysticism and Gnosticism // *JSJ* 35 (1984) 1–18; J. Baumgarten, The Book of Elchesai and Merkabah Mysticism // *JSJ* 17.2 (1986) 212–223; idem, The Qumran *Sabbath Shirot* and the Rabbinic Merkabah Tradition // *RdQ* 13 (1988) 191–213; C. Newson, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (Altanta, 1985) Esp. 45–58; D. Dimant, J. Strugnell, The Merkabah Vision in Second Ezekiel // *RdQ* 19 (1990) 331–348; idem, The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel at Qumran // Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity Presented to David Flusser / Ed. I. Gruenwald, S. Shaked, G. G. Stroumsa (Tübingen, 1992) 31–51; M. Himmelfarb, Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses (Oxford, 1993) Esp. 3–46; C. R. A. Morray-Jones, Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkavah Tradition // *JJS* 48 (1992) 1–31; idem, Paradise Revisited (2 Cor 12:1–12): The Jewish Mystical Background of Paul's Apostolate // *HTR* 86 (1993) 177–217 and 265–292; M. Hengel, Setzte dich zur meinen Rechten // Le trône de Dieu / Ed. M. Philonenko (Tübingen, 1993) 108–194, esp. 161–184; A. Goshen-Gottstein, The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature // *HTR* 87.2 (1994) 171–195; idem, Four Entered Paradise Revisited // *HTR* 88 (1995) 69–133; W. F. Smelik, On Mystical Transformation of the Righteous into Light in Judaism // *JSJ* 27.2 (1995) 122–144; J. M. Scott, The Triumph of God in 2 Cor 2:14: Additional Evidence for Merkabah Mysticism in St. Paul // *NTS* 42 (1996) 260–281; A. De Conick, Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas (Leiden, 1996) Esp. 46–149; J. C. Reeves, Heralds of that Good Realm: Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions (Leiden, 1996) Esp. 5–30; and A. Golitzin, Temple and Throne of the Divine Glory: «Pseudo-Macarius» and Purity of Heart // Purity of Heart in Early Ascetic and Monastic Literature / Ed. H. Luckman, L. Kulzer (Collegeville, 1999) 107–129, esp. 117–129. For scepticsm regarding Scholem's theses on continuities and mystical praxis, see esp. D. Halperin, Faces in the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision (Tübingen, 1988) (TSAJ, 19) Esp. 1–114.

patristic scholars to ignore works outside of their specialty, or of their traditional focus on the Greco-Roman background of patristic thought and (aside from a few Syricists) overall ignorance of, or indeed disdain for Semitics in general and Judaica in particular. It might also be ascribed, at least in part, to the fact that Christianity itself as known and practiced in Western Europe and the Americas owes so very much to the legacy of Augustine of Hippo.[8] The opening books of the latter's *De Trinitate*, for example, comprise a sustained attack against the teaching of the theophanies of the Penteteuch and prophets as, in any sense, true theophanies. For Augustine, the divine manifestations are instead angelophanies or even mere symbolophanies.[9] He does not allow for any *visio dei gloriae* on this side of the eschaton, nor for any transfiguration of the human being, however temporary.[10] The Christian lives instead wholly by faith, to whose grammar of knowledge Augustine devotes the remainder of his treatise on the Trinity.[11] For this pro-Nicene theologian, the

[8] Thus, for example, Stroumsa' choice of Augustine as the example *par excellence* of the fourth century shift in Hidden Wisdom… 139–146; and cf. Segal, Paul the Convert… 61, regretting that the vision of the glorious form and gospel of incorporation into the Glory «are strangely unfamiliar to modern Jewish and Christian religious sentiments. Neither Christianity nor Judaism openly transmitted these lively mystical Jewish traditions of the first century». With all due respect to Segal, the contrary is in fact true in the Christian East, especially in the ascetical literature where the *visio dei gloriae* and accompanying deification, *theôsis*, are precisely at the heart of things.

[9] He argues this point with special force in *De Trinitate* I–III and *Epistles* 147–148. For the critical text of the former, see M. Millet, T. Camelot (eds.), *Oeuvres de St. Augustin* 15, 2e serie: *La Trinité* (Paris, 1955) 183–321; and for the *Epistles*, see Obras de San Augustin. IIa / Ed. B. Cilleruelo (Madrid, 1972) 41–113; ET of *De Trinitate*, E. Hill, St. Augustine: The Trinity (Brooklyn, 1990) 97–146; and of the letters, W. Parsons, St Augustine: Letters III // *Fathers of the Church* 20 (New York, 1953) 170–183. For discussion of Augustine's argument against the Son as «the visible» of the Father in light of pro-Nicene polemic, see M. R. Barnes, Exegesis and Polemic in Augustine's *De Trinitate I* // *Augustinian Studies* 30.1 (1999) 43–59; and idem, Purity of Heart and the Vision of God: The Sixth Beatitude in Augustine's Trinitarian Theology (a to date unpublished essay which its author kindly made available to me).

[10] This is the usual thrust of his arguments. For discussion of certain allowances Augustine makes in later life for Moses and Paul as Godseers, however, see R. Teske, St. Augustine and the Vision of God // Augustine: Mystic and Mystagogue / Ed. F. Van Fleteren (New York, 1994) 287–308.

[11] See Barnes, Purity of Heart and the Vision of God… For another voice in the Western tradition, on the other hand, one should bear in mind the counterpoint of John Cassian's continuing legacy in Western monasticism. On the *visio dei luminis* in Cassian, see C. Stewart, Cassian the Monk (Oxford, 1998) 56–60 and 87–118. Regrettably, I know of no study which seeks to trace this current among Cassian's suc-

old traditions which I take him to be attacking in *De Trinitate* have become simply heretical — he calls them «Arian» — and for his descendents in the Christian West, they are thus a book closed and long forgotten.

East of the Adriatic, however, all that was known of Augustine until the late Middle Ages was his name, nor has he ever had any impact on the still flourishing Eastern monastic tradition which remains in consequence *Augustinfrei*. True, Eastern pro-Nicenes shared the Bishop of Hippo's objections to the older understanding of the Second Person of the Trinity as, by nature, the «visibility of the Father», «somehow expanding and contracting» (*modo se distendet, modo contrahet*), to use Augustine's words, depending on whether one is speaking of the heavenly throne or of theophany, and as constituting with Father and Spirit a Godhead of — quoting again from Augustine's polemic — «separable parts».[12] For the Eastern theologians, likewise, the three divine Persons shared a single, transcendent, ineffable and infinite — indeed, «formless» — divinity. This was a common consequence of the Nicene *homoousion*. On the other hand, it seems never (or, at least, very rarely) to have occurred to Eastern Christian monastic writers to deny the possibility of the *visio dei luminis* in the present life, or even of momentary transformation as a pledge and foretaste of the world to come. Eastern saints, particularly ascetic saints, have a tendency to «light up» in hagiography to the present day. The brilliant faces and luminous forms familiar from the angels of the old apocalypses are virtually standard fare.[13] It is, in parti-

cessors in the West, save some suggestive observations in E. Lanne, L'interprétation palamite de la vision de St. Benoît // Le Millenaire de Mont Athos: 963–1963. 2 Vols (Venezia—Chevtogne, 1963) Vol. II. 21–47.

[12] For *distendet/contrahet*, see *De Trinitate* II.25 (Latin 246; ET 115); and for «separable parts», *Ep* 148.4 (Latin 99; ET 226). The «expansion» and «contraction» of the Word to which Augustine is sarcastically referring comes in the middle of a discussion of Ex 24:10. See below the very different treatments accorded this key text by Apa Aphou implicity, explicitly by the Pachomian *Bohairic Life* and by Evagrius, as well as by the Rabbinic sources cited below.

[13] Examples are legion. For four such out of fifteen hundred years of tradition, see Abba Pambo and other fourth/fifth century desert fathers below and n. 65; the eleventh century account in Nicetas Stethatos' *Life* of his master, Symeon the New Theologian, which has the latter favored with a vision of his own elder and guide, Symeon the Pious, «standing at the right hand of the Glory of God», in Un grand mystique byzantin: Vie de Syméon le nouveau théologien / Ed. I. Hausherr // *OC* (1928) 8–10; and the nineteenth century «Conversation» of Nicholas Motovilov and Seraphim of Sarov († 1833), ET in G. P. Fedotov, A Treasury of Russian Spirituality (1950; repr. Belmont, 1975) 246–279. Note esp. the references Seraphim makes to Ex 34:29–35 and to Christ's Transfiguration in 273, together with Motovilov's purported description of his experience in 274: «Imagine in the center of the sun, in the dazzling brilliance of its midday rays, the face of the man who talks with you. You see the movement of his lips and the changing expression of his eyes, you hear his voice, you feel

cular, the Synoptic Gospel narratives of the Transfiguration which serve as the model of human transformation, to the degree, indeed, that local Church councils held in Constantinople a thousand years after Nicea upheld the possibility of the vision of the «uncreated light» of Mt. Thabor and declared this the official teaching of the Byzantine Church.[14] Witnesses to this faith, again especially among monks, are a constant feature of the intervening millenium, a continuity which is all the more striking in that it cuts across linguistic and cultural differences to include communities long out of communion with each other due, in particular, to the fifth-century Christological controversies. One finds it alike, in short, among so-called «Nestorians», «Monophysites», and orthodox Byzantines — among Greeks, Copts, Armenians, Georgians, Syrians, Ethiopians, and Slavs. For all these groups, «the blessed light of the Holy Trinity» (τὸ μακάριον φῶς τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος), to cite the late fourth-century anchorite, Evagrius of Pontus († 399), is the very stuff of both present and eschatological beatitude.[15] A Constantinopolitan abbot who lived six

someone grasp your shoulders, yet you do not see the hands, you do not even see yourself or his figure, but only a blinding light». For contemporary stories of like experiences among twentieth-century monks on Mt. Athos, see A. Golitzin, The Living Witness of the Holy Mountain: Contemporary Voices from Mount Athos (South Canaan, 1996) 34–54, 153–157, and esp. 194–215.

[14] On the importance of the Transfiguration in Eastern (here esp. Greek) Christian thought, see J. A. McGuckin, The Transfiguration of Christ in Scripture and Tradition // Studies of the Bible and Early Christianity (Lewiston—Queenstown, 1987) 1–143 for analysis, and 145–316 for source texts in translation. On the Hesychast Controversy of 1330–1350, see esp. J. M. Meyendorff, Introduction to the Study of Gregory Palamas / Tr. G. Lawrence (1964; repr. New York, 1998) Esp. 173–178 and 193–198.

[15] See on Evagrius and the vision of light, A. Guillaumont, Les visions mystiques dans le monachisme oriental chrétien, and Un philosophe au désert: Évagre le Pontique // Aux origines du monachisme chrétien: Pour une phénoménologie du monachisme (Abbaye de Bellefontaine, 1979) (Spiritualité orientale, 30) 136–147 and 185–212 (esp. 144–147 and 209–211); idem, La vision de l'intellect par lui-même dan la mystique évagrienne // *MUSJ* 50.1–2 (Beirut, 1984) 255–262; N. Séd, La Shekinta et ses amis araméens // *COr* 20 (1988) 233–247. Séd supplies, deliberately, a very important balance to Guillaumont's stress on Plotinus and Neoplatonism in La vision de l'intellect…, demonstrating Evagrius' acquaintance with Targumic traditions. Thus see also G. Bunge, Nach dem Intellekt Leben? Zum sogenannten «Intellektualismus» der evagrianischen Spiritualität // Simandron, der Wachklopfer: Gedankenschrift für Klaus Gember / Ed. W. Nyssen (Köln, 1989) 95–109; idem, Palladiana I: Introduction aux fragments coptes de l'*Histoire Lausiaque* // *StMon* 32 (1990); idem, Palladiana II: La version copte de l'*Histoire Lausiaque* // *StMon* 33 (1991) 7–21; and idem, Erschaffen und erneuert nach dem Bild Gottes: Zu den biblisch-theologischen und sakramentalen Grundlagen der evagrianischen Mystik // Homo medietas: Festschrift für Alois Maria Haas / Ed. C. Brinker von der Heyde, N. Largier (Berlin—Frank-

hundred years after Evagrius makes the same point when he writes of the appearance of Christ to the sanctified believer as occuring

> ...in a light which is personal and real [lit., «substantial», «essential»]. It is in a shape without shape [σχῆμα ἀσχήματος] and a form without form [μορφὴ ἀμόρφωτος] that He is seen invisibly and comprehended incomprehensibly.[16]

The oxymorons in my quotation are certainly not uncommon fare in any mystical literature striving to express the inexpressible, but the pair, «shape without shape» and «form without form», bring me back — at last, and with apologies for the long preliminary remarks — to the matter of monastic debate over the form of God and mystical vision which is the announced topic of this paper. My medieval abbot reflects at once the subject of the controversy and — not to pun — the shape of its post-Nicene resolution in the Christian East. Nearly all the literature we possess now reflects the views of the victors, the architects of post-Nicene spirituality, including that Evagrius whom

furt—New York, 1999) 27–41. For a perceptive if hostile discussion of Eastern Christian «Lichtmystik», regrettably without any sense of Jewish sources and parallels though sensitive to key scriptural passages, see H. Veit-Beyer, «Die Lichtlehre der Mönche des vierzehnten und der vierten Jahrhunderts, erörtet am Beispiel des Gregorios Sinaites, des Evagrios Pontikos, und des Pseudo-Makarios/Symeon // *JÖB* 31.1 (1981) 473–512. On the early eighth century, Mesopotamian Christian ascetic and mystic, John of Dalyatha, and his remarkable parallels on the *visio gloriae* with later Byzantine Hesychasm, see R. Beulay, L'enseignement spirituel de Jean de Dalyatha: Mystique syro-oriental de VIII[e] siècle // *Théologie Historique* 83 (1990) Esp. 440–461; and more briefly, idem, Formes de lumière et lumière sans forme: Le thème de la lumière dans la mystique de Jean de Dalyatha // *COr* 20 (1988) 131–141; and more broadly on the Syriac-speaking mystical tradition, idem, La lumière sans forme: Introduction à l'étude de la mystique chrétien syro-orientale (Chevtogne, 1987). For «light» in the theology of Gregory Nazianzus († ca. 390), the pre-eminent Greek theologian of post-Nicene, trinitarian orthodoxy and the master of Evagrius Ponticus, see J. A. McGuckin, Perceiving Light from Light in Light (Oration 31.3): The Trinitarian Theology of St. Gregory the Theologian // *GOTR* 39.1 (1994) 7–32.

[16] *Traités éthiques* / Ed. J. Darrouzès (Paris, 1967) (SC, 129) 322–324; ET: A. Golitzin, Symeon the New Theologian on the Mystical Life: The Ethical Discourses. Vol. I: The Church and the Last Things (New York, 1995) 169. On Symeon's sources for the *visio dei luminis* in Christian ascetical literature, see H. Alfeyev, The Patristic Background of St. Symeon the New Theologian's Doctrine of the Divine Light // *SP* 32 (1997) 229–38; A. Golitzin, Symeon the New Theologian on the Mystical Life: The Ethical Discourses. Vol. III: Life, Times, and Theology (New York, 1997) 81–105; and J. A. McGuckin, The Luminous Vision in Eleventh Century Byzantium: Interpreting the Biblical and Theological Paradigms of St. Symeon the New Theologian // Work and Worship at the Theotokis Evergetis 1050–1200 / Ed. M. Mullet, K. Kirby (Belfast, 1997) (Byzantine Texts and Translations, 27) 90–123.

I quoted above, the anonymous author of the *Macarian Homilies* (whom I shall also touch on below), and others among the monks, together with Church Fathers such as Athanasius and Cyril of Alexandria, and the Cappadocians, Basil of Ceasarea, Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa. With a few exceptions, we are thus also obliged to infer the views of the other side of the debate from the arguments and polemic of its critics. Still, enough comes through, I think, for us to recognize a number of themes familiar from the work of Scholem and his successors; echoes, I would say, from a background in Second Temple apocalyptic literature which resonates here among Christian ascetics in parallel with the then contemporary Rabbinic lore of the *merkavah* and *shi'ur qomah.*

III. The Syriac *Liber Graduum* and the Coptic *Vitae* of Pachomius and Aphou: Echoes of pre-Nicene Traditions of the *Visio dei* with Roots in the Second Temple and Affinities with Rabbinic Thought

Let me begin with three instances where I think we encounter instances of the older, pre-Nicene tradition: the Mesopotamian *Liber Graduum*, the *Bohairic Life of Pachomius*, and the likewise Coptic *Life of Apa Aphou of Pemdje*. The *Liber* was written, anonymously, in Syriac probably in mid-fourth century.[17] It is a work intended to reconcile wandering ascetics of the type we find in the *Apocryphal Acts* of the Apostles or, earlier, in the *Gospel of Thomas*, with the episcopally-guided local churches of Sassanid Persia.[18] Particularly of note for us are a few lines from the 28th of its 30 discourses where, mentioned *en passant* as a kind of given, is precisely the old Christology of theophany that Augustine would later set his face against in North Africa. Citing Ex 33:11, the author remarks that «the Glory of God Almighty [ܐܠܗܐ ܫܒܝܚܐ ܕܐܬܓܠܝ ܠܡܘܫܐ] was revealed to Moses on the mountain like a

[17] For the Syriac text and accompanying Latin translation, see the edition by M. Kmosko, *PS* III (Paris, 1926); ET: of *Mimro* 12 in S. Brock, The Syriac Fathers on Prayer (Kalamazoo, 1987) 45–53. On the most recent argument for the dating of the *Liber*, see K. Fitschen, Messalianismus und Antimessalianismus: Ein Beispiel ostkirchlicher Ketzergeschichte (Göttingen, 1998) 108–119.

[18] On the peculiarities of early Syrian Christian asceticism and the *Liber*'s effort to link it with urban churches, see again Fitschen, Messalianismus… 120–128, and specifically on the *Liber*'s use of the *Gospel of Thomas*, A. Baker, The Gospel of Thomas and the *Liber Graduum* // *NTS* 12 (1965) 49–55. See also R. Kitchen, Conflicts on the Stairway to Heaven: The Anonymity of Perfection in the Syriac *Liber Graduum* // *Symposium Syriacum* VII / Ed. R. Lavenant (Roma, 1998) (OCA, 256) 211–220.

man [ܒܪ̈ܢܫܐ ܕܡܝܪ̈ܐ]», and repeats the statement a few lines below, but with a slight difference: «And our Lord [ܡܪ̈ܝ] was revealed to all the prophets like a man».[19] I note first of all the parallelism between «the Glory» and «our Lord», and further that in Christian Syriac *moran*, «our Lord», invariably (to the best of my knowledge) designates the Second Person of the Trinity, the Son. Secondly, the «Glory» of the first passage is distinct from «God Almighty». The latter denotes the Father, since the Syriac *moryo ahid kul*, like our English phrase, is a rendering of the Greek θεὸς παντοκράτωρ, and a possible rendering thus of the first article in the Nicene Creed: πιστεύω εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα. What makes these two passages still more interesting is the fact that the author of the *Liber* is not fighting with anyone about this point. He takes it thus for granted, thirdly, that it is the Son of God who is the divine Glory and who appeared to Moses and the other saints of Israel in human form, «like a man». Perhaps I should note as well that the *Liber* elsewhere makes specific allowance for the *visio dei gloriae* as open to the believer even «in this life», or «in this age» (ܒܗܕ ܥܠܡܐ ܗܢ).[20]

Turning to Egypt, we find the same understanding of Christ as Glory, together with accounts of the vision of the Glory. The *Life* of Pachomius († 345), founder of common-life monasticism, has come down to us in several recensions, of which the Greek *Vita Prima* and the *Bohairic Life* are presently considered the most authentic witnesses and of roughly equal antiquity — late fourth, early fifth century.[21] Both versions present Pachomius as a visionary, but where the *Vita Prima* mentions but does not describe his visions, the *Bohairic Life* is not so reticent. I have in mind particularly three visions taking place in the monastery church: the first accorded Pachomius alone, the second to him in the company of his favorite disciple, Theodore, and the last to Theodore alone after his master's death.[22] In the first vision, Pachomius sees the east wall of the monastery sanctuary

[19] Kmosko, *PS* III… 802:10–11 and 20–21.

[20] Ibid., *Mimro* 15, 373:12–13; and cf. also *Mimro* 12, esp. 288:12–289:1; ET: *Syriac Fathers on Prayer* 46.

[21] For discussion of the Pachomian sources, see P. Rousseau, Pachomius: The Making of a Community in Fourth Century Egypt (Berkeley, 1985) 37–55, and A. Veilleux in the «Introduction» to the latter's ET of the Pachomian materials: Pachomian Koinonia. 3 vols (Kalamazoo, 1980, 1981, 1982), here Vol. I. 1–6. For the critical texts of the *vitae*, see L.-T. Lefort, S. Pachomii vita boharice scripta (1925, repr. Louvain, 1953) (CSCO, 89, Scriptores coptici, 7); idem, S. Pachomii vitae sahidice scripta (1933–1934; repr. Louvain, 1953) (CSCO, 99–100, Scriptores coptici 9–10); and F. Halkin, S. Pachomii vitae graecae (Subsidia Hagiographica, 19) (Bruxelles, 1932). I shall be citing from Vielleux's ET of both the *BoLife*, in Pachomian Koinonia… Vol. I. 23–266, and the Greek *vita prima*, Ibid. 297–407.

[22] *BoLife* 73, 76, and 184; ET: Pachomian Koinonia… Vol. I. 95–96, 99–100, and 228–229, resp. (Lefort, Vita boharice scripta… 76–77, 81, and 162–164, resp.).

> ...become all golden and on it there was a large icon, like a large picture [of someone] wearing a crown... that crown was glorious in the extreme... [and] Before the icon were two great and very august archangels, motionless and contemplating the Lord's image.[23]

The saint is at first overcome by «the ray of fear» emanating from the image, then comforted by a «sheen of mercy...like a rich, holy chrism». When he tells certain of the monastery's elders about the apparition, «the old men were greatly struck with fear, and they said, "These holy men are like those of heaven"»,[24] which I take to mean that they understood Pachomius to have experienced a throne vision like that which the angels enjoy in the heavenly temple or palace. The second vision occurs while Pachomius and Theodore are praying together in the church:

> While they were praying, they saw appearing above them, as high as a tower, a great throne on which God was seated under the form in which he chose to appear to them.[25]

[23] *BoLife* 73; I:95–96 (Lefort, Vita boharice scripta… 76:5–77:24). Cf. the *Vita prima* 88; I:257–258 (Halkin, S. Pachomii vitae graecae… 59:9–60:10), which mentions the visions and, though it omits any description whatever, does add the interesting detail of Pachomius comparing himself to the elders around Moses at the theophany of Ex 19 (Halkin, S. Pachomii vitae graecae… 60:1–2). On the difference in the handling of the vision, see Guillaumont, «Les visions mystiques» 140–143, who reads the *BoLife*'s version as borrowing from «les apocalypses de Pierre et de Paul qui ont profondément nourri la piété Égyptienne» (142). The observation of influences from the apocalypses is certainly perspicacious, but the assertion that these indicate a later and therefore suspect reworking is not convincing. If anything, the *Vita prima* would seem the better candidate for subsequent editing in its elimination of embarrassing details, e.g., as here the suggestions of anthropomorphism. See also Pachomius' trip to heaven, «the luminous air» of divinity, along the lines and with explicit citation of Paul in 2 Cor 12:2–4, in *BoLife* 114 (Pachomian Koinonia… Vol. I. 166–168; Lefort, S. Pachomii vitae sahidice scripta… 18–23), and for Egyptian ascetics as enamored of apocalypses such as the Enochic books and the *Ascension of Isaiah*, see the remarks directed against this literature in the longer, Coptic text of Athanasius of Alexandria's *Festal Epistle* of 367, tr. by D. Brakke, Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism (Oxford, 1995) 330–332, for example: «Who has made the simple folk believe that these books belong to Enoch...? On what basis will they say that there is an apocryphal book of Isaiah?...The apocryphal books are filled with myths...the beginning of discord!» (330). Cf. also in contrast the approving citation of the *Ascension of Isaiah* 8:21 by the reputed disciple of Antony, Ammonas, in the latter's Ep. X; Syriac text edited with Latin translation by M. Kmosko // *PO* 11 (1915) 594:3–11, together with Ammonas' cryptic remark that *sunt homines super terram qui ad hanc mensuram* [i.e., the ascent to heaven] *pervenere* (594:11), and then see the old men who greet Pachomius' vision with wonder in *BoLife* 73, below and n. 24, together with the experience of Abba Silvanus, below and n. 64. Athanasius was fighting an uphill battle!

[24] *BoLife* 73, I:97 (Lefort 78:16–20).

[25] *BoLife* 76, I:99–100 (Lefort 81:14–29).

The third vision takes place when Theodore is summoned to the church by an angel, who tells him:

> «Get up quickly and go to the church, for the Lord is there». He got up as the voice had instructed him, for he always used to walk with great vigilance and with unshakable trust because his thoughts were always in heaven beholding the Glory of the Lord... when he came to the doorway of the church, he went in and saw an apparition. Where the latter's feet were, there appeared to him something like a sparkling sapphire and he was unable to look at the face because of the great light which unceasingly flashed forth from it... [Theodore] was troubled and overcome with fear... He thought about all Israel long ago in the desert and how such great fear came upon them... when the Lord revealed himself to them... They all saw him on Mt. Sinai... the whole mountain was so filled with fire...[26]

This last is specifically related to the theophany of Ex 24, especially verse 10 with its reference to the sapphire-like stuff beneath the feet of God, presumably enthroned. All three accounts are of throne visions. Another biblical echo may be of Is 66:1, «Heaven is my throne», in the great height of the throne in the second vision. I do not, however, recall the divine crown of the first vision appearing in any of the biblical theophanies, but it does show up in *merkavah* and related literature, e.g., in *Hebrew* or *3 Enoch* 29:1–2, and, relatedly, in Metatron's own crown in *3 Enoch* 12–13.[27] Reference to Metatron also reminds me of another of Pachomius' visions, this time in the *Paraleipomena* (Chronicles) of the saint, where Christ appears to him as a «youth», νεώτερος-νεανίσκος, of «ineffable countenance» whom an accompanying angel then introduces as «the Lord of Glory».[28] Besides the obvious echo of I Cor 2:8, we might also recall the reference to Metatron as a «youth», נער, in *3 Enoch* 2:2.[29] In short, Pachomius' and Theodore's visions here are at the least reminiscent not only of the biblical manifestations of the *kevod YHWH*, but of the throne visions characteristic of later Second Temple era apocalypses and, indeed, of the still later texts — roughly contemporary, in fact, with the *Pachomiana* — from Rabbinic literature with their ascent to a

[26] *BoLife* 184; I:228–9 (Lefort 162:28–164:10).

[27] P. Schäfer, with M. Schlüter and H. G. von Mutius, Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur (TSAJ, 2) (Tübingen, 1981) 290, # 912, and 289, ## 896–897; ET: P. Alexander, 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 284 and 265–286.

[28] *Paraleipomena* 18; ET: Veilleux, Pachomian Koinonia... Vol. II. 40; Greek text: Halkin, 142:13–19. For νεώτερος or the variant, νεανίσκος, see ll. 14 and 22–23; for the ἀνεκλάλητον πρόσωπον and τὴν ἄφραστον θέαν, ll.14–15, and ll.18–19 for κύριος τῆς δόξης.

[29] Schäfer, Synopse... 287–288, ## 884–886; ET: Alexander, 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch... 257–259. For comment, see Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism... 50–51. On the antiquity of Enoch-Metatron's title, «youth», see A. A. Orlov, Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch* // *Journal of the Pseudepigrapha* 18 (1998) 80–82.

vision of the glorious form of God enthroned in the highest heaven. The one great difference, of course, is that these Christian texts identify that glorious form with Christ.

While the Pachomian texts share with the *Liber Graduum* the lack of any particular note of controversy, this is not the case with my third example, *The Life of Apa Aphou of Pemdje*. The latter is a Coptic text from the fifth century which was published with French translation and accompanying commentary by Edouard Drioton in *Revue de l'orient chrétien* in 1917, and it centers around a reply, precisely, to Archbishop Theophilus' paschal epistle of 399.[30] Apa Aphou is a hermit living in extreme asceticism among the beasts — antelopes in this case — of the upper Egyptian desert. An angel comes to him with news of the Archbishop's distressing new doctrine which, as the saint is informed, seeks «to exalt the Glory [*mpeooy*] of God» by denying the *imago dei* in humanity.[31] For reasons we shall see, this must have appeared to Aphou as a flat contradiction. In any case, armed with heavenly encouragement, the old man goes off to Alexandria to instruct the Archbishop in the latter's error. He, a strange figure in rags and tatters, is naturally kept cooling his heels in the patriarchal antechambers for some days before being allowed into the great man's presence. Once there, however, he loses no time in humbly pressing his point: has the Archbishop forgotten Gen 1:26? Theophilus replies with the assertion that the *imago* was lost with Adam's fall. Aphou counters by citing Gen 9:6, the prohibition against murder addressed to Noah — thus *after* the Fall — because «in his own image God has made humankind».[32] Theophilus then essays a slightly different tack, contrasting divine splendor with the corruption and filth of the human body. Can the «true and unapproachable light» (recalling I Tim 6:16), he asks, have anything to do with a beggar defecating in the gutter?[33]

Aphou does not reply immediately to the Archbishop's question, but instead turns in a quite unexpected and apparently unrelated direction. He appeals to the sacrament of the Eucharist. If, he argues, the latter is truly the body of Christ, and if Christ who said «I am the living bread come down from heaven» (Jn 6:51), is the very same one who spoke to Noah forbidding murder because God made us «in his own image», then Theophilus, by acknowledging the sacramental presence, must perforce also recognize the *imago*

[30] Drioton, La discussion d'un moine... 95. All who have written on the *Life of Apa Aphou* agree on its fifth century provenance and direct relationship to the anthropomorphite debate, thus: Drioton, La discussion d'un moine... 92–94; Florovsky, Theophilus of Antioch and Apa Apou of Pemdje… 99–101 and 117–18; Clark, The Origenist Controversy… 50–51 and 59–64; and Gould, The Image of God… 549–550.

[31] Drioton, La discussion d'un moine... 95.

[32] Ibid. 98.

[33] Ibid.

even in fallen humanity.[34] The old man then concludes by returning to the question of the unapproachable light in relation to the human body:

> As for the Glory of the Greatness [*peooy de mpmegethos*] of God, which it is impossible for anyone to see because of its incomprehensible light, and as for human weakness and imperfection... we think that it is like a king who orders the making of an image which everyone is to acknowledge as the image of the king. Yet everyone [also] knows perfectly well that it [= the image] is only [made] of wood together with other elements... but... the king has said, «This is my image»... How much the more so, then, with man?[35]

According to the *Life of Aphou*, as indeed — though for very different motives — in the accounts of Sozomen and Socrates, Theophilus promptly surrenders to the old man's arguments, and the two part in an atmosphere of happy reconciliation. For the *Life* at least, the story is one of the triumph of the desert's traditional wisdom over the philosophical learning of the Greeks.

I should like to pause here a bit in order to «unpack» what I take to be Aphou's argument, particularly since its density and — I believe — relative complexity have proven effectively impenetrable to the few scholars who have attempted to deal with it: Drioton in 1917, Georges Florovsky in the late 1950's, together Elizabeth Clark and Graham Gould in the past decade.[36] The key, in my opinion, lies in the relation between Aphou's appeal to the Eucharist and the other, I daresay more familiar elements which appear in the colloquoy with Theophilus: the *imago dei* of Gen 1:26 and 9:6, the «unapproachable light» in which God dwells of I Tim 6:16, and these three texts in

[34] Drioton, La discussion d'un moine... 98–99.

[35] Ibid. 99–100. The use of Gen 9:6 and comparison with the statue of the King recalls R. Hillel, Leviticus Rabbah… 34.3. Asked why he considers bathing a religious duty, the sage replies: «If the statues of kings... are scoured and washed by the man appointed to look after them... [who is therefore] exalted in the community of the great... how much more shall I [look after my body] who have been created in the image and likeness, as it is written, "for in the image of God made He man"», tr. J. Israelstam and J. S. Slotki (London, 1939) 428. I am grateful to M. Smith for having brought this text to my attention in his The Image of God: Notes on the Hellenization of Judaism, with especial reference to Goodenough's work on Jewish Symbols // *BJRL* 40 (1958) 473–512, here 475–476.

[36] It is chiefly on the basis of the linkage between Gen 1:26, 2:7, and 9:6 in the *Life of Aphou* that Drioton, La discussion d'un moine... 116 ff., argued for the connection between Aphou and the Syro-Mesopotamian Audians described by Ephiphanius of Salamis in the latter's *Panarion* 70.2–6. For the text of the latter, see the edition by K. Holl, revised by J. Dummer, Epiphanius III: Panarion 65–80, GCS (Berlin, 1985), here 323–349; ET: *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis* / Tr. F. Williams (Leiden, 1987), here Vol. II. 402–428. For Florovsky's and Gould's responses, see n. 3 above.

connection with the likeness or statue of the king in Aphou's concluding illustration. Apa Aphou, as Drioton pointed out eighty years ago, clearly believed in a divine body «clothed with incomprehensible light».[37] What escaped the French scholar, however, were three interrelated elements in addition to this insight: first, the identification of a divine body of light at once with the human form of the *kevod YHWH* (and of the «angel of the Lord) in the biblical theophanies and with the image (*tselem*) and likeness (*demut*) of God in Gen 1:26;[38] second, the equation of both the *kavod* and the original divine likeness, *demut*, with the «Man from Heaven», to cite I Cor 15:47 and 49, i.e., with the Second Person of the Christian Trinity;[39] and 3) both of the above as linked to, or functionally identical with, the «living bread come down from heaven» of Jn 6:51, the food of the Eucharist.[40]

It is the last which is especially significant in that it forms the real punchline of Aphou's argument since it touches on the very «stuff», we might say, of salvation as both the desert elder and the archbishop understood the latter, specifically the answer to the question: how do we partake of God? Their answer: by feeding on the divine body of light.[41] Here I think we arrive at the reason for Aphou's selection of John 6 instead of the more familiar Synoptic narratives of the Last Supper. The «living bread come down from heaven» of Jn 6:51 must first of all be read in parallel with «the Son of Man come down from heaven» of Jn 3:13, the descent thus of the Heavenly Man, and, second, the «living bread» occurs in the Fourth Gospel in the context of a discourse where Christ is comparing himself to the manna of Ex 16. To the latter

[37] Drioton, La discussion d'un moine... 127.

[38] See J. Barr, Theophany and Anthropomorphism in the Old Testament // *VT Suppl.* 7 (1960) 31–38, esp. 37–38; together with Quispel, Ezekiel 1:26... 9; Fossum, Jewish-Christian Christology... 263 ff.; and Goshen-Gottstein, The Body as Image... 172; together with A. Marmorstein, The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God (1939; repr. New York, 1968) Vol. II. 133–157.

[39] See again Quispel, Ezekiel 1:26... 1–2 and 8–11; Fossum, Jewish-Christian Christology... 260–73; and Stroumsa, Form(s) of God... 279–86.

[40] On Jn 6:31–58, see P. Borgen, Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo // Supplements to *Novum Testamentum* 10 (1965) Esp. 147–182, and n. 177 on parallels in the Fourth Gospel with *merkavah* mysticism. On the latter theme, see also Rowland, John 1:51...; and J. A. Draper, Temple, Tabernacle and Mystical Experience in John // *Neotestamentica* 31.2 (1997) 263–288, esp. 275–285.

[41] For the importance of the notion of «deification», *theosis*, in Eastern Christian thought, see J. Meyendorff, Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes (New York, 1974) 32–41, and L. Bouyer, The Spirituality of the New Testament and the Fathers / Tr. M. P. Ryan (New York, 1982) 416–421. Relatedly, on the centrality and interdependence of *theosis* and the Eucharistic presence in the thought of Theophilus' nephew and successor, Cyril of Alexandria († 444), see H. Chadwick, Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy // *JTS*, ns 2 (1951) 145–164.

I would add, third, Ps 78:24–25, which speaks of the manna as «the grain of heaven» and «the bread of angels».[42] Fourth, in connection with both angelic diet and the Exodus theophany, I am reminded of a passage from the Babylonian Talmud which I chanced on while reading Ira Chernus' study of Rabbinic mysticism, and which I think sheds a certain light on Apa Aphou's argument. The passage is from *b.* Ber. 17a, quoting from Chernus' translation:

> Rav was in the habit of saying: The coming aeon is not like this aeon. In the coming aeon there is neither eating nor drinking nor procreation...Rather, the righteous sit with their crowns on their heads and feed upon the splendor of the Shekinah [מזיו השכינה], as it is said, «And they beheld God and ate and drank» (Ex 24,11).

Chernus later cites a functionally identical passage from *Abot d'Rabbi Nathan* which adds the phrase, «like the ministering angels», to the citation of Ex 24:11.[43] I submit that it is something very like the thinking of these two Rabbinic texts which underlies Apa Aphou's appeal to the Eucharist, and I think that it fits very well, indeed, into the complex of the *imago* and body of light which features so essentially in his reply to Theophilus.[44]

---

[42] See again Borgen, Bread from Heaven… 148–153 and 175–177 on Christ as the object of the Sinai theophany (151–152), on feeding on the Torah given at Sinai, and other references to the biblical theophanies, and cf. below and n.43, together with Evagrius' use of Ex 24:10–11 below.

[43] Chernus, Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism… 75, citing *b.* Ber. 17a and, a little below (77), *Abot de R. Nathan*, version A, 1.3a, with its additional reference to the angels. Admittedly, Chernus also notes (76) that these several elements — Ex. 24:10–11, vision of the *Shekinah* and «feeding on it» as eschatological anticipation, together with «food of the angels» — occur together only in these two passages. On the other hand, «feeding on the light of the *Shekinah*» in reference to both humans and angels does occur frequently. See thus his entire chapter, «Nourished by the Splendor of the Shekinah», 74–87.

[44] For a very similar chain of associations in a Christian author writing in Egypt two centuries earlier, see Clement of Alexandria, *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 10–13 / Ed. F. Sagnard (Paris, 1948) (SC, 23) 76–84. Clement begins in *Exerpta* 10.1 (Sagnard 76) by stating that the Son, like the angels but unlike the Father, has «his own form [μορφή] and body [σῶμα]»; in 10.5 (78) that the Son «is called "light unapproachable" [cf. I Tim 6:16, together with Aphou and Theophilus above] which "eye has not seen" [cf. I Cor 2:9], the "face [πρόσωπον] of the Father"» (cf. Theophilus' reply above to the protesting monks); then appeals explicitly to the Transfiguration account of Mt. 17:2 («face as the sun») in 12.3 (84), and concludes the sequence in 13.1–5 (84) with a stream of references to Jn 6:31–58: «This is the "heavenly bread" and spiritual nourishment of life [cf. Jn 6:49 ff.]» which is given to the saints and to the angels. There is no mention of the Son's «form» and «body» as humanlike, which one would not expect given Clement's sensitivity to philosophical tradition and dependence on Philo, but — save any explicit reference to Sinai — the other elements in this exegetical complex, which I take to be presumed by Apa Aphou, are all present.

Permit me then to paraphrase Aphou's alarm at the paschal epistle of 399 and his catechism of the archbishop. To exalt the divine Glory by denying the image which is the human form must have been for our desert monk a *contradictio in adjecto*. Christ, the Son of God, *is* for him the image, the Heavenly Man. So off the old man goes to instruct the archbishop in the basics which he seems to have forgotten. These include the making of humanity after the model in heaven who is the *kavod*, the μορφὴ θεοῦ (cf. Phil 2:6), and, when Theophilus tries to bring up the discrepancy between corrupt human flesh and divine light, there is the reminder of the Eucharist as marking the advent of the New Covenant in anticipation of the age to come when the blessed shall be fed by the light of the body of the Glory and where, indeed, believers are fed even now by the same body. In other words, we might say that for Aphou the difference between the two covenants lay in the fact that while the elders of Israel ate from it only once, all Christians are offered it as their «daily bread». Then, topping off the argument, there is the illustration of the king's image whose point is the following analogy: as the living flesh of the king is to the wood and other inanimate materials of his statue, so is the living and «incomprehensible light» of God's Glory, Christ, to our flesh. Yes, Aphou says in answer to Theophilus' objection raising the incommensurability of human flesh with divine splendor, the discrepancy is indeed vast. It is absolute, in fact. But then, his argument goes on to ask in effect, is it not true that Christians have been given that very flesh of light to eat? And, eating it, do not believers become truly «partakers of the divine nature» (to recall II Peter 1:4)? And in what else, the old man adds implicitly, might his Eminence say that the Christian hope of salvation consists? So it is scarcely surprising, at least according to the terms assumed by this document, that Theophilus is left with no other recourse than to capitulate, which, as the *Life of Aphou* has it, he manages quite graciously.

IV. Evagrius of Pontus († 399): The Shape of the post-Nicene Adjustment in the East

Other monastic writers of the time had different terms of reference, however, and these included that Evagrius Ponticus whom I noted some pages back, and whose influence was also, not accidentally, perhaps the primary target of Theophilus' purge of the «Origenists» among the monks of Egypt following the Archbishop's *volte face* before the angry mob reported by Sozomen and Socrates.[45] As Samuel Rubensen demonstrates in the introduction to his splendid, recent edition of the *Letters* of St. Anthony the Great, Evagrius was part of a large network of philosophically informed desert dwellers who appear to have included the «father of monks» him-

[45] See Clark, The Origenist Controversy… 7, 18–23, 62–84, and 105–121.

self.[46] I single Evagrius out because he was also unquestionably the most important member of this group. His writings comprise perhaps the single most influential body of works in Eastern Christian ascetico-mystical literature, and, in the person and oeuvre of his disciple, John Cassian, they would travel to Latin-speaking monasticism as well.[47] As a disciple of the Cappadocian fathers, Basil the Great († 379), Gregory Nazianzus († ca. 390) and Gregory of Nyssa († ca. 394), who were and are to Greek trinitarian orthodoxy as Augustine would be to the Latin, Evagrius was a thoroughly orthodox advocate of the Niceno-Constantinopolitanum. He was not so orthodox in other regards, however, being too much the student of Origen — including advocacy of the latter's theory of a double creation and consequently dubious anthropology (no place for the body in the world to come) — not to escape sharing in the latter's posthumous condemnation at the Fifth Ecumenical Council in 553, a fact which led to such of his works as survive in Greek being usually sheltered under the name of a less controversial figure, Nilus of Sinai.[48] Other works, though lost in Greek subsequently to 553, continued to

[46] S. Rubenson, The Letters of St. Antony: Monasticism and the Making of a Saint // *Studies in Antiquity and Christianity* 5 (1995) Esp. 64–71, 81–88, and Rubenson's conclusions in 88–91. See also on Evagrius, A. Guillaumont, Un philosophe au désert…; idem, Les *Kephalaia Gnostica* d'Évagre le Pontique et l'histoire du origénisme chez les grecs et chez le syriens (Paris, 1962) (Patristica Sorbonensia, 5) Esp. 40–80, together with G. Bunge, Origenismus-Gnosticizmus: Zum geistesgeschichtlichen Standort des Evagrios Pontikos // *VC* 40 (1986) 24–54, on Evagrius as continuing Origen's struggle with Gnostic thought in Egypt, and idem, Évagre le Pontique et les deux Macaires // *Irénikon* 56.2–3 (1983) 215–227 and 323–360, on Evagrius' close relationships, as disciple to masters, with Macarius of Scete and Macarius of Alexandria, two of the leading figures in later fourth century Egyptian monasticism.

[47] See Stewart, Cassian the Monk… 11–12 and throughout, on the influence of Evagrius.

[48] See Guillaumont, Les *Kephalaia Gnostica*… 15–36 on the fate of Evagrius' most important doctrinal work, the *Kephalaia Gnostica*, and 129–258 on the reception of his works. See also Guillaumont's publication of the Syriac text(s) in Les six centuries des *Kephalaia Gnostica* d'Évagre le Pontique / Édition critique de la version commune et édition d'une nouvelle version Syriaque // *PO* 28.1 (1958) 1–261. The «nouvelle édition», as Guillaumont demonstrates in his monograph, is in fact the earlier and more accurate translation of the *Kephalaia*. For a comprehensive listing of Evagrius' published works in Greek and Syriac, a matter of great complexity owing to the condemnations of 553, see S. P. Brock, Isaac of Nineveh: «The Second Part», Chapters IV–XLI (Louvain, 1995) (CSCO, 555; Scriptores Syri, 225) xxiv–xxix. Evagrian texts preserved in Greek can be found in *PG* 79. 1165–1233 (under the name of Nilus of Sinai), and in the first volume of Nicodemus Hagiorites' anthology, Φιλοκαλία τῶν ἱερῶν νηπτικῶν (1783, repr. Athens, 1957) I. 38–57 and (under Nilus' name) 176–189; together with A. and C. Guillaumont (eds.), Traité pratique ou le Moine (Paris, 1971) (SC, 170–171); and P. Géhin (ed.), Évagre le Pontique: Scholies

be transmitted in Syriac translation and under Evagrius' own name. They had, in either case, been around long enough to leave an indelible mark on both Greek and Syriac monastic literature.[49]

Enough certainly survives of Evagrius for us to touch here on his reconfiguration, in accordance with his reading of post-Nicene orthodoxy, of those themes and scriptural loci which we found at work in both the visions of Pachomius and in Aphou's exchange with Theophilus. His reworking at once affirms these traditional elements *via* a thorough-going process of interiorization, and denies them through a repeated insistence that the divine being, as transcendent and immaterial, has neither body nor form. Let me begin with the first, the matter of interiorization, while recalling both the monastery church as locus of the Pachomian visions cited above and Aphou's appeal to the Eucharist, together with the *Bohairic Life*'s explicit and Aphou's implicit invocation of Exodus 24:10–11. All of these reappear in Evagrius, save that in him they become descriptions of the inner life of the sanctified human spirit or intellect, the *nous*. Thus we find the *nous* as temple in the following from the *Kephalaia Gnostica*:

> The intelligible temple is the pure intellect which now posseses in itself the «wisdom of God, full of variety», [and] the temple of God is he who beholds the sacred unity, while the altar of God is the contemplation of the Holy Trinity.[50]

---

aux Proverbes (Paris, 1987) (SC, 340). For the Syriac Evagrius, see especially the texts and accompanying Greek retroversions published by W. Frankenberg, Evagrius Ponticus // AAWG.PH, Neue Folge 13.2 (1912); and J. Muyldermans, Evagriana Syriaca: Textes inédits du British Museum et de la Vaticane (Louvain, 1952) (Bibliothèque du Muséon, 31), together with idem, À travers la tradition manuscrite d'Évagre le Pontique: Essai sur les manuscrits grecs conservés à la bibliothèque nationale de Paris (Louvain, 1931) (Bibliothèque du Muséon, 3). For ET(s) of Evagrius, see K. T. Ware, P. Sherrard, G. W. Palmer (eds.), The Philokalia: The Complete Text. Vol. I (London, 1979) 28–71; J. E. Bamberger, The Praktikos and Chapters on Prayer (Spencer, 1970); and M. W. O'Laughlin, Evagrius Ponticus: *Antirrheticus* (Selections) // Ascetic Behavior in Greco-Roman Antiquity: Sourcebook / Ed. V. L. Wimbush (Minn, 1990) (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity, 6) 243–262. For a German translation of the *Letters* collected in Syriac in Frankenberg, see G. Bunge, Briefe aus der Wüste (Trier, 1986).

[49] See again Guillaumont, Les *Kephalaia Gnostica*... 139–258, and idem, Évagre le Pontique // *DSp* 4. 1731–1744.

[50] *Kephalaia Gnostica* V.84, *PO* 28:213; and cf. the «Supplementary Chapters» to the *KG* in Frankenberg, Evagrius Ponticus... 429–465, esp. ch. 37 (457) on the intellect again as «temple» (ναός) and 45 (461) as altar (θυσιαστήριον), together with Ep. 33 (Frankenberg 589), evoking 2 Cor 5:1–4, «May the Lord grant...that your tabernacle [σκηνή] become the lodging of the holy angels and of our Savior, Jesus Christ».

In Evagrius' 39th epistle, the intellect is identified with the holy mountains of Sinai and Zion, and thus as the locus of theophany:

> If then, by the grace of God, the intellect both turns away from these [i.e., the passions] and puts off the old man, then it will see its own constitution at the time of prayer like a sapphire or the color of heaven, which recalls as well what the Scripture names «the place of God» seen by the elders on Mt. Sinai [Ex 24:10]. It calls this place and the vision the peace [cf. Ps. 75:3] by which one sees in oneself that peace which surpasses every intellect and which guards our heart. For another heaven [ἄλλος οὐρανός] is imprinted on a pure heart, the vision of which is both light and the spiritual «place»...[51]

It is on the «spiritual mountain» of the intellect that the «blessed light of the Holy Trinity» descends «at the time of prayer».[52] Evagrius thus accomplishes, in the words of Nicholas Séd ten years ago, «the first interiorization [of the Sinai theophany] of which we have written attestation», just as his play on Ps 75:3, according to the same scholar, «follows the uninterrupted line of the traditional interpretation: Salem, Jerusalem, vision of peace, place of the Presence [or *Shekinah*]».[53] Here, too, is the interiorization of the Eucha-

[51] Frankenberg, Evagrius Ponticus... 593; and for other echoes of Ex 24:10, cf. also the «Supplementary Chapters» 2 (425), 4 (427), 21 (441) and 25 (449).

[52] «Supplementary Chapter» 4 (Frankenberg, Evagrius Ponticus... 427). See also «Supplementary Chapters» 26 (450) and Ep. 17 (579) for the «dawning» of the Trinity «at the time of prayer», and cf. Guillaumont, La vision de l'intellect..., esp. the latter's reference to Plotinus, *Enneads* V.5.8 and the «dawning of the One». On the «light of the Trinity» and vision of God as light, see also in Frankenberg, Evagrius Ponticus... «Supplementary Chapters» 4 (427), 30 (455), 53 (465) and Epistles 34 (593) and 58 (609). In the *Antirhheticus*, see «Prologue 7»; and see also *de mal. cog.* 8, *PG* 79. 1221B; *Kephalaia Gnostica* I.35 (*PO* 28:33), I.81 (53), III.30 (111): the intellect as «beholder of the Trinity»; VI.87 (255): the «light [of God] appears to the intellect joined to the heart»; *Praktkos* 64 (Guillaumont, *SC* 171:646–647); *de oratione* 52 (Φιλοκαλία I:181; ET: *Philokalia* I:62): Christ the Word «is accustomed to reveal himself [ἀναφαίνεσθαι] at the time of prayer» — perhaps an echoing of Jn 14:21, together with the passages from *de orat.* cited below, nn 53–61. For discussion, see again Guillaumont, La vision de l'intellect...; idem, Les visions des moines au désert... 144–148; Beyer, Die Lichtlehre der Mönchen... 478–491; Bunge, Geistliche Vaterschaft... 69–72 (esp. valuable for noting the interiorization of the Sinai and Zion motifs); Séd, La Shekinta et ses amis...; M. W. O'Laughlin, Origenism in the Desert: Anthropology and Interpretation in Evagrius Ponticus. PhD dissertation, University of Michigan (Ann Arbor, 1988) 179–186; and most recently, C. Stewart, Imageless Prayer and the Theological Vision of Evagrius Ponticus // *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9.2 (2001) 173–204.

[53] Séd, La Shekinta et ses amis... 242. For the νοῦς as Zion, see also «Supplementary Chapter» 28 (Frankenberg 453), together with *KG* V.88 (*PO* 28:213) and VI.49 (*PO* 28:237), and Ep. 25 (Frankenberg 583). For «knowledge of the Holy Trinity» as

rist itself, since for Evagrius it is the intellect which is now the place of divine manifestation and which, as it were, feeds on the light of the *Shekinah*, with the latter effectively understood in this re-working as the common radiance of the Three divine Persons. The equation of the *nous* with the Eucharist, and thus with the «body of God», is made explicit in a passage from the treatise *On the Eight Evil Thoughts*, where Evagrius takes the Eucharistic words of Christ and applies them to the intellect, adding by way of a reference to the throne vision of Isaiah 6 that the *nous* is the divine throne: «For it is there», he writes, «that God takes his seat and there that he is known».[54]

In that it is the light of the transcendent Trinity which appears within the sanctified intellect, itself immaterial and bodiless, it is no surprise to find Evagrius insisting time and again on the *visio dei gloriae* as also bodiless and formless. This insistence is especially marked in his brief but immensely influential treatise, *On Prayer*. As the foremost contemporary interpreter of Evagrian thought, Dom Gabriel Bunge, remarks, the latter work features «a scarcely-veiled polemic... against the materialist notion of the vision of God to which the anthropomorphite monks at Scete had succombed».[55] I think it safe to say myself that the monks of Scete and elsewhere in Egypt, together with still others throughout the Christian world at the turn of the fifth century (recall Augustine's polemics in Numidia and compare them with Cyril of Alexandria's letters to the monks of Palestine in the 430's),[56] were not so

«the spiritual mountain» which the νοῦς is to ascend, recalling Moses in Ex 19 and 24, see «Supplementary Chapters» 43 (Frankenberg 459).

[54] *PG* 79. 1228C.

[55] Bunge, Palladiana I… 108.

[56] See Wickham, Cyril of Alexandria: Select Letters… 132–179, for the letters on anthropomorphism addressed to Palestinian monks, esp. Ep. 1–3 (132–147), 6 (156–157), and 15 (176–179). The first three address specifically questions of anthropomorphism. In Ep. 1 (137–139), Cyril inveighs against the «stupid and wicked» notion that the divine nature should be equated with the human form, and warns his correspondents that they are instead to seek «the world above» through their conduct (139). Here there is surely some relationship presupposed between questions of the divine form and heavenly ascent. Ep. 2 (140–152) objects against a reading of Phil 2:6–7 that sees the Second Person «emptying heaven» of his presence for the sake of the Incarnation. Cyril protests that the divine essence is wrongly thus «quantified» (πεπόσωται) and spatially limited. Here we may recall particularly Augustine's sarcastic reference a generation earlier in Numidia to divine «expansion» and «contraction» — reacting, be it noted, to the theophany of Ex 24:10! — as well as to a God of «separable parts» (see above and n. 12). In Ep. 6, Cyril rejects the idea that the Savior's (human) body has been simply merged with his divinity to become «consubstantial» with it, an idea which we find, interestingly enough, duplicated two centuries later in Timothy of Constantinople's (ca. 600) list of condemned «Messalian» propositions: «They say... that the body of the Lord was uncircumscribed [απερίγραπτον], like the divine nature». For Timothy's and other lists, see C. Stewart, «Working

much the victims of some novel «heresy» as they were the continuation of traditions which long antedated them, but which had also been rendered anachronistic — as I noted earlier — by the doctrinal developments of the fourth century. In any case, and to return to Evagrius, the latter's short work, *On Prayer*, feature a number of sayings directed against the notion of a divine form or body, notably numbers 67–68, 73–74, and 114–117.[57] Saying 67 is directed against human efforts to image the divinity:

> When you are praying, do not shape within yourself any image of the Deity, and do not let your intellect be stamped with the impress of any form; but approach the Immaterial in an immaterial manner, and then you will understand.[58]

In two following sayings, however, the impression of God as having a form is instead ascribed to demonic activity. As Saying 73 also provided me with the title for this paper, I shall quote it in full:

> When the intellect attains prayer that is pure and free from passion, the demons attack no longer with sinister thoughts, but with thoughts of what is good. For they suggest to it [i.e., the *nous*] an illusion of God's Glory in a form [σχηματισμός] pleasing to the senses, so as to make it think that it has realized the final aim of prayer. A man who has spiritual knowledge has said that this illusion results from the passion of self-esteem and from the demon's touch on a certain area of the brain.[59]

The last sentence, particularly the last phrase (less the demon, of course) has a modern ring to it — visions of the divine form as the result of psychopa-

---

the Earth of the Heart»: The Messalian Controversy in History, Texts, and Language to A.D. 431 (Oxford—New York, 1991) 245–279, here 278, and for comment, Fritschen, Messalianismus… 70–73 and 230. Perhaps related, at least insofar as it may indicate his addressees' reading material, there is Cyril in Ep. 15 replying to the question whether or not the giants of Gen 6:2 were the result of copulation with angels, a possible reference to *I Enoch* 6 ff. Finally, and related I think to the web of scriptural allusions we saw in Aphou above, there is Cyril's «Epistle to Bishop Calosirus» (Wickham 214–221) replying both to questions of anthropomorphism among the monks of the Fayyum, as well as to the proposition that the Eucharist loses its efficacity after a day — like the manna, I take it, of Ex 16:14–21, though Cyril does not make the connection with the Exodus passage explicit .

[57] Texts in *PG* 79. 1165–1199C; Nicodemus, Φιλοκαλία I:176–189 (both under the name of Nilus); ET(s) in Bamberger, Praktikos and Chapters on Prayer… 52–80, and Ware et alii, The Philokalia… I:57–71. Migne's text and Bamberger's translation, on the one hand, and the *Philokalia*, Greek and English, on the other, differ slightly. I have chosen to follow the latter.

[58] Φιλοκαλία I:182 (ET: Ware I:63).

[59] Note: the Φιλοκαλία version has δόξα (Ware: «glory») here, while Migne's sources have instead γνῶσις θεῖος καὶ οὐσιώδης (Bamberger 67: «divine and essential knowledge»).

thology![60] What is primarily to my point, however, is Evagrius' affirmation of the *visio dei gloriae* as «the final aim of prayer», in which he is clearly at one with the traditions represented both by the *merkavah* texts of the Rabbis and by Pachomius and Apa Aphou, and his simultaneous negation of that vision as in any way of a human form. The one place where I found that he does use the word form, εἶδος, in a positive sense comes by way of a brief remark on the Bridegroom of *Song of Songs* 5:15: «The form of the Bridegroom is as a form of light».[61] The combination of the *Song of Songs*, Bridegroom, divine form, and light is itself surely suggestive of, among other things, the *shi'ur qomah* traditions, though again any note of the human form is deliberately absent.[62] We are rather in the presence of the «substantial light» and «formless form» which will, for example, appear six hundred years later in the citation from Symeon the New Theologian quoted above, and nearly a thousand years later in the Hesychast movement of Mt. Athos and the whole Byzantine commonwealth.

V. Survivals and Continued Polemic in the *Apophthegmata*, *Historia Monachorum* and *Lausiac History*

Before I close, I should like to note that Evagrius was not alone in his efforts to recast older traditions of the *visio dei formae*. At the same time as he was working, or even a little before, we find both both polemic directed against and occasional direct echoes of those traditions. Permit me then simply to cite here three brief anecdotes from as many fourth/fifth century monastic sources, and then conclude with a fourth passage from an exact contemporary of Evagrius who lived and wrote not in Egypt, but somewhere in Mesopotamia on the Roman side of the border with Sassanid Persia. The first of my three sources, the *Sayings of the Fathers* (*Apophthegmata Patrum*), is a collection of narra-

[60] I am thinking here, not too unfairly I hope, of Halperin, Faces in the Chariot… 7, 67–68, 451, and more briefly, idem, Heavenly Ascensions in Ancient Judaism: The Nature of the Experience // *SBLSP* 26 (1987) 218–232.

[61] The phrase appears in P. Géhin's recovery of a fragment from Evagrius' otherwise lost *Scholia on the Song of Songs*, in Evagriana d'un manuscrit basilien (Vaticanus Gr. 2028, olim Basilianus 67) // *Mus* 109 (1996) 71, lines 11–12, and French tr. 72. See also Géhin's n. 34, p. 72, identifying the εἶδος φωτός as belonging to Evagrius' commentary on Song of Songs 5:15; and cf. on this use of the Song of Songs: G. Bunge, Evagrios Pontikos: Der Prolog des *Antirrhetikos* // *Studia Monastica* 39 (1997) 95–96, and on the νοῦς as filling the role of «divine body» in Evagrius' thought, Bunge, Nach dem Intellekt Leben?… 102–104, together with Ibid. 101–102, on the notion in Evagrius of the «divine light» as — echoes of Apa Aphou above — «the bread of angels».

[62] See Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism… 36–42, and Stroumsa, Form(s) of God… 276–277.

tives and *logia* of the earliest monks, though the collection itself was not edited in its present form until the turn of the sixth century, probably in Palestine and in the neighborhood of Gaza.[63] I cannot resist including here its brief account of Abba Silvanus' journey to heaven. One day, the holy man's disciple comes to speak with him, only to find the old man rapt in a trance. He tries again several times over the next few hours with the same result. Finally,

> [He] finds him at rest and says to him, «What happened to you today, Father?» And the other said, «I was sick today, child». But he, seizing his feet, said, «I won't let you go until you tell me what you saw». The old man says to him, «I was caught up into heaven and I saw the Glory of God [ἡρπάγην εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ εἶδον τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ] and I was standing [ἱστάμην] there until now, and now I have been sent away.[64]

True, there is no mention of the divine form in this story, but we do find other elements — the trance, rapture, *visio gloriae*, and the «standing» before, presumably, the divine throne — which are all elements familiar from sources in apocalyptic literature, in the Pauline corpus (esp. 2 Cor 12), and in Rabbinic *merkavah* lore.[65] I would add, though it does not appear here, that the transformative aspect of these mystical traditions also shows up in the *Apophthegmata*, as in:

> They used to say that, just as Moses received the image of the glory of Adam when his countenance was glorified, so too with Abba Pambo, that his face shone like lightening, and he was as a king seated on his throne. And the same thing applied as well to Abba Silvanus and to Abba Sisoes.[66]

---

[63] I am obliged, for want of a critical text, to cite from the «Alphabetical Collection» of the *Apophthegmata* in *PG* 65. 76A–440D. For a summary of the scholarship this century on the early monastic sayings collections, see D. Burton-Christie, The Word in the Desert: Scripture and the Quest for Holiness in Early Christian Monasticism (Oxford—New York, 1993) 76–98. For an ET of the «Alphabetical Collection», see B. Ward (tr.), The Desert Christian: The Sayings of the Desert Fathers (New York, 1975).

[64] Silvanus 3 // *PG* 65. 409A (ET: Ward 223).

[65] On «standing» in apocalyptic literature and its associations with the heavenly court, see De Conick, Seek to See Him… 89–92, citing *1 Enoch* 39:12, 40:1, 47:3, 68:7; *2 Enoch* 21:1; *Testament of Abraham* 7–8; and *Ascension of Isaiah* 9:9–10. Cf. also Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkabah Mysticism… 66, on the same association in Rabbinic thought, citing *y.* Ber. 2c and *Genesis Rabbah* 738: «There is no sitting in heaven... the angels have no joints». For the note of transformation, see Morray-Jones, Transformational Mysticism… Esp. 13–31.

[66] Pambo 12, 327A (ET 197); and cf. Sisoes 14, 396BC (215), and Silvanus 12, 412C (224) for the shining face reminiscent of Ex 34:29–35. For temporary transformations into fire, see also Arsenius 27, 96BC (ET 13), and Joseph of Panephysis 7, 229 CD (ET 103); and cf. Enoch's transformation into fire in *3 Enoch* 15, text in Schäfer, Synopse... 284 and 289, ## 855 and 900; ET: OTP. Vol. 1. 267.

Here I would underline the connection between the «glory» and Adam, the reference to Moses' encounter with the *kavod* on Sinai and subsequent descent with shining face in Ex 34:29–35, so important for Paul in 2 Cor 3:7–4:6, and the image of a king enthroned. All of these elements are likewise familiar from the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and, again, Rabbinic sources.[67]

Trips to heaven and converse with angels are relatively frequent in another collection of early monastic stories and sayings, the *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*, written just prior to the turn of the fifth century by an anonymous monk from Byzantine Palestine who is recounting the tour-pilgrimage he and some fellow members of a monastery in Jerusalem had taken to visit the already famous sites and personalities of monastic Egypt.[68] What catches my eye particularly is a story directed precisely against visions of the *merkavah* type. Abba Or, whom the *Historia* holds up to its readers as one of the great old men, describes in the third person a temptation that he had experienced:

> The demons came to him [i.e., to Or himself] in a fantasy, showing up as the angelic hosts together with a chariot of fire and many spear-carriers, and [a figure] like an emperor on tour who says to him, «O man, you have accomplished everything! Worship me and I shall take you up like Elijah![69]

The devil's appeal is clearly to the self-esteem that we saw Evagrius also warn against, and Or is not fooled, but counters with a confession of Christ as King and the vision promptly vanishes. Yet, given the frequency of ascents to

---

[67] See again Morray-Jones, Transformational Mysticism… 16–28; and, relatedly, Tabor, Things Unutterable… 15–19 (on Adam and Glory); Segal, Paul the Convert… 39–49 (transformation, Adam, Moses, ascent, and Glory) and 152–7; Goshen-Gottstein, The Body as Image… 178–183 (Adam, Moses, and the «body of light»); W. A. Meeks, Moses as God and King // Religions in Antiquity / Ed. J. Neusner (Leiden, 1968) 354–371, esp. 361–365 (Moses, Adam, Sinai, and the image); and Segal again, Paul and the Beginnings of Jewish Mysticism // Death, Ecstasy, and Otherworldly Journeys… 95–122, esp. 102–114.

[68] Critical text by A.-J. Festugière, Historia Monachorum in Aegypto: Édition critique du texte grec et traduction annotée (Bruxelles, 1971); ET: N. Russell, B. Ward, Lives of the Desert Fathers (Kalamazoo, 1981). For trips to heaven, see *HM* 10, Patermuthis 21–22 (Festugière 83:128–84:146; ET: 85); 11, Sourous 5–7 (91:20–92:37; ET 88–9); and 21, Macarius 5–12 (125:25–126:66; ET 108–109). For angels' converse with the monks, see *HM* 8, Apollo 5–6 (48:38–49:1; ET 71), 38–41 (62:243–63:265; ET 76–7), and 44–47 (63:273–65:298; ET 77); 12, Helle 1–5 (92:1–94:32; ET 90) and 14–15 (96:76–98:87; ET 91–2); and for the equation of the angelic with the monastic life, see the «Prologue» 5 (7:30–36; ET 49) and *HM* 1, John of Lycopolis 6 (34:417–421; ET 62), where Abba John characterizes the monk as one who «stands in the presence of God» participating in the praises of the angelic choirs (and see above, n. 65).

[69] *HM* 2, Or 7 (38:52–56; ET 64).

heaven elsewhere in the Historia,[70] together with the story of Silvanus' trance and Evagrius' polemic, it is difficult not to suspect that this sort of *merkavah* vision may have been fairly common, or, at the least, that it was a well known type.

Indeed, the vision of the *merkavah* as demonic temptation shows up again in a third collection of monastic stories, this time by one of the same four disciples of Evagrius whom I mentioned at the beginning of this essay, Palladius of Heliopolis. The latter wrote his *Lausiac History* sometime in the 420's about the monks, primarily of Egypt, whom he had known personally or else had heard about.[71] Besides the expected paradigms of ascetic virtue, the *History* also contains a few admonitory tales, examples of the dangers that could befall someone living the monastic life. The Palestinian monk, Valens, is one of the latter, and his sin is, once again, an overweening pride — «arrogance», in Palladius' words — which makes him an easy victim of demonic dellusion. Once more, too, the specific temptation is a false *merkavah* vision:

> [When] the demon was fully satisfied that Valens was completely won over... he went and disguised himself as the Savior. He appeared at night in a vision of a thousand angels carrying lamps and a fiery wheel [τρόχος πύρινος] in which, so it seemed to Valens, the Savior had taken shape...

A false angel then appears to Valens and tells him to leave his cell and go adore the apparition:

---

[70] See above, n.68, and as well the post-mortem ascent of sainted monks who are carried up to heaven by angels, to the accompaniment of celestial hymnody, in *HM* 8, Apollo 16–18 (52:106–27; ET 72); 11, Sourous 8 (92:38–41; ET 88–9); and 14, Paphnutius 23–24 (109:122–110:132; ET 98).

[71] Critical text by C. Butler, The Lausiac History. Vol. II (Cambridge, 1903); ET: R. T. Meyer, Palladius: The Lausiac History (New York, 1964) (Ancient Christian Writers, 34). For the text of Ananisho's Syriac translation, see R. Draguet, Les formes syriaques de la matière le l'Histoire Lausiaque. Vol. II: Éditions des chapîtres 20–71 (Louvain, 1978) (CSCO, 398; Scriptores Syri, 173); and ET: W. Wallis-Budge, The Paradise or Garden of the Holy Fathers (1907, repr. New York, 1972) (The Burt Franklin Research and Source Works Series. Philosophical and Religious Historical Monographs, 112), two volumes. See also R. Reitzenstein, Historia Monachorum et Historia Lausiaca: Eine Studie zur Geschichte des Mönchtums und der frühchristlichen Begriffe Gnostiker und Pneumatiker (Göttingen, 1916) 143–184, esp. 172–173 for the vision cited below; and Bunge, Palladiana III... 8–19, for the Coptic materials on Evagrius which are not included in the extant Greek text, esp. Evagrius' converse with angels in 10–11 and 16–17, together with his own reported experience of a vision including heavenly ascent in 15, with elaborate echoes of 2 Cor 12. On Palladius' links with Evagrius, see idem, Palladiana I... 81–83.

> So he went out and, when he saw marshalled in a line those who carried lamps, and the Antichrist himself about a stade or so away, he fell down and adored.[72]

Ananisho, Palladius' translator into Syriac in the early seventh century, adds a few details which further underline the resemblance of this story to *merkavah* literature. I quote here from E. Wallis Budges' translation from the Syriac:

> ...when Valens had gone forth and seen the ranks bearing lamps of fire, and the Antichrist himself sitting upon a chariot [*markabto*] of fire — now he was distant from him a mile — he fell down and worshipped him.[73]

Following his vision, Valens runs off to the monks' church in order to announce to the assembled brethren that he no longer needs the Eucharist, since «I saw Christ this very day!» The fathers thoughtfully clap him in irons for a year and pray over him until he comes to his senses.[74]

A number of things are worth notice here. First, there is the association of the false Christ with a «shape», particularly we may assume a human shape. It is difficult not to catch an echo of Evagrius' polemic, including the note of the sin of pride, in the story his disciple tells. Second, there is the size of the figure Valens sees. He sees and thinks he recognizes it from six hundred feet away in Palladius' account, and from a mile off in Ananisho's translation. I think that we can safely assume, especially in the Syriac version, that the figure is assumed to have been of super-human size, and that we may have thus an allusion to the *shi'ur qomah* tradition. Third, we have a clear enough allusion to the *merkavah* in Palladius' «fiery wheel», but this becomes unmistakably explicit in Ananisho's use instead of the Syriac equivalent, *markabto*. Fourth and last, the tie-in to the Eucharist is itself of significance. In the Pachomian visions cited above, it is precisely the *synaxis* or church which is highlighted as the locus of the divine presence. Each of the three apparitions mentioned in the *Bohairic Life* shows up in the eastern part of the building, that is, in the sanctuary or altar area, while for Aphou the Eucharist is the very center and pivot of his argument in favor of the human form of divinity, the body of God. I cannot therefore help wondering if perhaps Palladius has added a layer here to the polemic which further distorts the older tradition.

---

[72] *HL* 25:4–5 (Butler 79:22–80:8; ET 85). See 80, line 1, for τρόχος πύρινος.

[73] Wallis-Budge, Paradise of the Fathers… I:133; Syriac: Draguet 213–214, esp. 213:11–20, and 213:13–14 for ܥܠ ܓܠܓܠܐ ܕܢܘܪܐ («on a chariot of fire»).

[74] Cf. a similar dispute in monastic Egypt about the Eucharist in the «Alphabetical Collection»: Daniel 7, *PG* 65. 156D–160A (ET: Ward, Desert Christian… 53–54); and Mark the Egyptian 1, 304A–C (ET 151), where the erring monks are instead corrected more gently by angelic visions. For comment, see Clark, The Origenist Controversy… 64–66.

Not only are the anthropomorphite monks wrong and deluded, as in Evagrius, or even just heretics, as with Evagrius' other disciple, John Cassian,[75] but now they are deniers of the Church and sacraments as well.

VI. The Adjusted *Merkavah* and *visio gloriae* of the *Macarian Homlilies*

It is true, on the other hand, that there were ascetics who simultaneously claimed the possibility of a vision of the Trinity with their physical eyes and understood both Baptism and Eucharist as matters of relative indifference. These were the Messalians of Syro-Mesopotamia, condemned in a series of episcopal synods held between ca. 390 and 431.[76] Writing somewhat earlier, but out of the same traditions and as a result sometimes (by both ancients and moderns) wrongly identified with the heretical Messalians, is the unknown author of the so-called *Macarian Homilies*, a body of monastic letters and discourses which was sheltered for centuries under the distinguished name of Macarius of Scete.[77] The homilist has arguably been as influential as Eva-

[75] See *Collationes* X.2 (CSEL, 291. 5–6), *haeresis quae dicitur Anthropomorphitarum*; and X.5 (287. 7–8), *inepta quoque Anthropomorphitarum haeresis* (ET: Chadwick 126 and 128); and cf. the characterization of Abba Serapion's (Cassian's anthropomorphite foil) «abominable interpretation» (*detestandae huius interpretationis*) of Gen 1:26 as representing, on the one hand, a *gentilem blasphemian* (X.5; 290:22–291:9; ET 128), and, on the other hand, as operating *sub illa quodammodo iudaica infirmitate* (X.6; 291:25; ET 128). On the «Jewish weakness» here as in fact representing «a very specific exegesis» of, especially, Is 66:1, see E. Wolfson, Images of God's Feet: Some Observations on the Divine Body in Judaism // People of the Book: Jews and Judaism from an Embodied Perspective / Ed. E. Eilberg-Schwarz (Albany, 1992) 143–181, here 152–153. Wolfson is commenting on Origen's use of the phrase, «Jewish weakness», in considering the interpretation of Is 66:1 and (once again!) Ex 24:10, as preserved by Theodoret of Cyrrhus († 461) in the latter's *Quaestiones in Genesim* // *PG* 80. 113A–116B, and cf. Stroumsa, On the Incorporeality of God… 345 ff.

[76] See the lists of condemned Messalian propositions set in parallel and translated by Stewart, Working the Earth of the Heart… 245–279, here 246–249 (the inadequacy of Baptism), 250–257 (perception of the Spirit with the physical senses), 258–259 (the visibility of the Trinity), and 268–269 (indifference to the Eucharist). For discussion, see Fitschen, Messalianismus… 18–88.

[77] See again Fitschen, Messalianismus… 145–158, for a review of the twentieth century scholarship on the *Macarian Homilies* and Messalianism, and 176–235 for a close comparison between the *Homilies* and the condemned propositions which concludes (238) that the homilist was used and «radically reinterpreted» by a later movement. The Greek texts of the *Homilies* are preserved in four medieval, Byzantine collections, of which three have been published in critical editions: Collection II, far and away the most popular and well-represented of the three, by H. Dörries, E. Klos-

grius in subsequent Eastern monastic literature, and both men, though separated by hundreds of miles and by very different cultural settings — Greek and Coptic Egypt *versus* Semitic Syro-Mesopotamia — also shared in a number of other ways: in fidelity to the Niceno-Constantinopolitanum, in acquaintance with the Cappadocian fathers (though in «Macarius'» case the influence traveled in both directions),[78] in knowledge of the Alexandrian tradition of spiritual exegesis, and, as a result of these, in the effort to reconfigure ancient traditions in accordance with Nicene trinitarian orthodoxy. Like Evagrius, too, «Macarius» (to give this writer the name he has gone by for centuries) is also an advocate, and if possible even more forcefully so, of the *visio dei luminis,* which he insists is not a mere product of the intellect, a *noêma*, but:

> ...a divine light, shining essentially and substantially [ἐν οὐσίᾳ καὶ ὑποστάσει] in the hearts of the faithful... the divine and essential [οὐσιώδης] light which appears and shines in souls more than the light of the sun.[79]

---

termann, M. Kroeger, Die 50 geistlichen Homilien des Makarios (Berlin, 1964) (PTS, 4); ET: G. Maloney, Pseudo-Macarius: The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter (New York, 1992); Collection III by V. Desprez, Pseudo-Macaire: Oeuvres spirituels. Vol I: Homélies propres à la Collection III (Paris, 1980) (SC, 275); and Collection I by G. Berthold, Makarios/Symeon: Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung I des Vaticanus Graecus 694 (B). 2 vols (Berlin, 1973). In citing from these, I shall be placing the collection number at the beginning in upper-case Roman numerals, followed by the homiliy number in lower-case, and the section and subsections in arabic numerals, with the page and line number of the critical text in parenthesis followed, where applicable, by the page of Maloney's translation.

[78] See R. Staats, Makarios-Symeon: Epistola Magna. Eine messalianische Mönchsregel und ihre Umschrift in Gregors von Nyssa *De instituto christiano* // *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaft in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse*. Dritter Folge, 134 (1984) Esp. 28–42; idem, Gregor von Nyssa und die Messalianer (Berlin, 1968) (PTS); and briefly in Desprez, Introduction // SC 275. 47–54.

[79] I.xvii.1.3 (Berthold I, 188:19–189:2). Cf. also I.ii.3.12–15 (8:13–9:25) on Adam's glory reflected in Moses' face as a type of Christ; x.3.1–2 (137:31–138:14) on the heavenly light of glory; xviii.4.4 (198:5–7) and 6.2 (203:2–12) on the «eternal light» in parallel with the manna of Ex 16 and Ps 75:25; xxxv.1–10 (Berthold II, 42–44) from Adam's loss of «glory» (δόξα) to Christ's recovery of it; 1.2.3 (127:6–18); lviii.1–2 (182–185:6); II.iv.9–12 (Dörries 33:137–137:198; ET: Maloney 54–55) on the body of Christ and Phil. 2:6–7; iv.13 (37:199–214; 55–56) on the OT theophanies «in an unapproachable glory of light»; vi.5–7 (67:72–70:109; 76–77) on the uncreated crowns of light awaiting the righteous; viii.2–3 (77:15–79:41; 81–82) on the cross and robe of light, and 6 (83:76–89; 83) for Macarius' testimony to his own experience of this light; xii.8–11 (110:86–113:136; 100–101) on Adam's robe of divine glory; xv.38 (149:537–150:547; 122–123) on the transfiguration of Christ and the believer; xx.2–3 (188:16–189:43, 150–151) on Christ as the robe and ἀρρητον φῶς; xxvi.9–10 (209:100–210:130; 163–164) on Christ the divine fire, with reference to

In support of this assertion he appeals at different points to scriptural witnesses, as for example the long catena of texts in one homily which begins with 2 Cor 3:18 and 4:6 (transfiguration and the glory of Christ within the heart), then moves to Pss 118:18 and 42:3 (the light of God's face), Acts 9 and 22 (the light at Paul's conversion), I Cor 15:49 (the «image of the heavenly man»), Phil 3:21 (the «body of glory»), I Cor 2:9–10 («what eye has not seen»), and R 8:11 (the indwelling Spirit).[80] Elsewhere he will appeal frequently to Eph 4:13 («the measure of the stature of Christ's fulness»),[81] to Jacob's ladder in Gen 28:12–19,[82] to Moses' shining face in Ex 34:29–35,[83] to the Synoptic Transfiguration accounts,[84] to Jn 14:21 and 17:22–24, which

Lk 12:49; Heb 12:29; Ex 3:2, 2 K 4:11, and Heb 1:7; xxxi.5 (249:55–250:68; 195–196) on the heavenly fire of I K 18:18; xlvii.1 (304:1–12; 232) again on Moses' reflection of divine glory as a type of Christ; III.iii.3.1–2 (Desprez 90); xvi.8 (206); xxxv.2.4 (272:37–274:47); xxvi.4 (302–4), 6 (306:1–308:25); and xxviii.4.4 (342:40–344:53). I note that this listing reflects merely my own unsystematic notes and is by no means complete.

[80] I.lviii.1–2 (Berthold II, 182–185:6); and cf. the shorter catena in I.xvii.1 (Berthold I, 188:5–189:2) which features 2 Cor 3:18; Acts 9:3 and 7:56; Jn 14:21, Pss 18:9 and 118:105 (LXX). For other references esp. to 2 Cor 3:7–4:6, esp. 3:18 and 4:6, see Berthold, Stellenregister zum Alten und Neuen Testament… II. 232, where I count eleven references to 3:18 and two to 4:6. See also Collection III: iii.2 (Desprez 90:10–12); viii.4 (128:37); and xxviii.2.2 (334:9 ff.).

[81] See Berthold, Stellenregister zum Alten und Neuen Testament… II. 233 (fourteen references); Dörries, Bibelstellenregister… 352 (six); and Desprez, Indices des citations scripturairs… 355 (seven).

[82] See I.iv.14.2 (Berthold I, 56:5–10): so uninterruptedly was God with Jacob that «He opened the gates of heaven to him and showed him the heavenly house [οἶκος], manifesting it to him in the form of a ladder». Cf. relatedly the interesting conflation of Gen 28:12–19 and Ezk 1:1 ff in Macarius' contemporary in Egypt, Ammonas: Ep. 13 (*PO* 11. 602:3–603:8); ET: D. J. Chitty, S. P. Brock, The Letters of Ammonas (Oxford, 1979) 19–20; and see below Macarius' use of Ezk 1:1 ff.

[83] See I.ii.3.14 (Berthold I, 9:5 ff.): Satan sees the glory on Moses' face which Adam had (ref. 2 Cor 3:7); iv.1.1 (141:4 ff.): Moses' glory a type of Christ's; xxvi.2.2 (II, 46:14–15): Moses kept faith with God and received the Glory; II.xxxvii.1 (Dörries 265f:12ff.; Maloney 207); xlvii.1 (304:1–12; 232); and III.xx.1.3 (Desprez 236:31–34): Moses received upon his face the «seal... of the glory of the divine light which Adam had before the Fall...The Glory of God and divine vesture». Related to the discussion and citations above from Aphou and Evagrius on the relations between the heavenly meal of Ex 24:10–11, the «bread from heaven» of Jn 6:31–58, and the «light of the *Shekinah*», cf. Macarius in II.iv.12–13 (Dörries 36:180–37:205; Maloney 55–56) with its deployment, in order, of Heb 12:29, I Cor 2:9, Jn 6:35 and 58, I Tim 6:16, and Ex 24:18; to the conclusion that Moses' food on Sinai during his forty day fast was the «heavenly fire» of divinity and «unapproachable glory of light».

[84] See I.xxxv.2 (Berthold II, 81:12 ff.); II.viii.3 (Dörries 78:25–80:43; ET 82): the light of Mt. Tabor shines within the heart; and xv.38 (Dörries 149:537–150:547;

promise an indwelling manifestation of Christ and participation in the Glory,[85] and to Rev 21 on the «new earth and new heaven».[86] Those familiar with Alan Segal's recent interpretation of Paul as a *merkavah* mystic will recognize the Pauline loci cited above. They are the same, by in large, as play a central role in Segal's argument.[87] Macarius, it seems to me, is saying much the same thing in the late fourth century, albeit against the changed background of the Nicene settlement, which should come as no surprise since he, too, is a kind of Christian *merkavah* mystic.[88]

This is borne out in spectacular fashion in the opening paragraphs of the best known collection of Macarius' works, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies*. The first paragraph of *Homily* I is a straight paraphrase of Ezekiel's vision of the chariot throne, and in the second paragraph Macarius moves to its interpretation:

> The prophet truly and assuredly saw what he saw, but [his vision] also suggested something secret and divine, a mystery truly hidden from eternity and after generations made manifest in these last days with the appear-

ET 122): the glory of Christ on Tabor as promise both of the body's eschatological transformation, and of the inner vision of glory available inwardly even now, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν (150:543; and recall the *Liber Graduum*'s *bhon 'olmo* above). Note also the use in this context of Jn 17:22 (150:545 ff.).

[85] See Berthold, Stellenregister zum Alten und Neuen Testament… II. 229 for Jn 14:21 (seven times) and 23 (eight times); Dörries, Bibelstellenregister… 328–329 (three times for 14:21 and 23, see n.84 above for 17:22); and Desprez, Indices des citations scripturairs… 352 for Jn 14:23 (six times). See also above, n.80, where Jn 14:21 is included in the catena demonstrating the reality of the divine light available to the believer in this life.

[86] See Berthold, Stellenregister zum Alten und Neuen Testament… II. 236 (twice); Dörries, Bibelstellenregister… 334 (once); Desprez, Indices des citations scripturairs… 356 (once).

[87] Segal, Paul the Convert… Esp. 9–11, 58–64, and 156–157.

[88] Thus the use of Ezek 1 cited immediately below, but see as well certain passages in the *Homilies* which recall apocalyptic ascent narratives or the later *hekhalot* texts, though here in interiorized form: for example, perhaps esp. I.xxxiii.3.2–3 (Berthold II, 30:9–22): the purified soul sees with its inner eye the «heaven of light» beyond the firmament, the camps (παρεμβολαί) of the angels, and the «tabernacle not made with hands». Cf. also II.xiv.6 (Dörries 125:45–51; ET 107): the «luminous country» of divinity, and again the «camps of the angels and spirits of holiness»; III.iv.1 (Desprez 94:8–13): Christ reigning over the heavenly palace and staff; xv.3 (174:36–39): Christ coming to the soul and making «palaces» (παλάτια) within it for his dwelling (μονή); xix.1 (228:13–20): the soul as great «city» of the King, receiving the «sword of the Spirit», the «heavenly image of Christ», and the «spiritual seals of light» (τὰ οὐράνια τοῦ φωτος πνευμάτικα σίγνα); and xxv.5 (282:23–25): the palace (παλάτιον) set up for divine inhabitation in the invisible place (χῶρος) within the soul.

> ance [lit., epiphany] of Christ. For Ezekiel beheld the mystery of the soul which is going to receive its Lord and become his throne [θρόνος] of glory, since the soul which has been made worthy of the fellowship with the Spirit of his [i.e., Christ's] light, and which has been illumined by beauty of his ineffable Glory after having prepared itself for him as a seat [καθέδρα] and dwelling place [κατοικητήριον] becomes all light, and all face, and all eye.[89]

Gershom Scholem touched briefly on the importance of this passage sixty years ago, noting at the end of his chapter on the *hekalot* texts in *Major Trends* that Macarius represents «a mystical reinterpretation of the *merkavah* tradition».[90] Other than Gilles Quispel, I know of no scholar of the *Homilies* who has since picked up on the echoes of Jewish-Christianity in Macarius.[91] Put another way, Macarius does effectively the exact same thing with Ezekiel's chariot as Evagrius does with the Sinai theophany. Note in the passage cited how he begins with an affirmation of the prophet's vision: Ezekiel really and truly did see the *kavod*. Macarius is speaking to other monks who, I rather think, were quite keen on this passage as exemplary of the sort of vision that they hoped to enjoy themselves — recall the Pachomian materials I cited earlier, as well as Abba Silvanus' heavenly journey, or, in a negative phrasing, Abba Or and the monk Valens. Only after this affirmation does the homilist introduce his qualifying «but», his point being that since, as he writes elsewhere, «with Christ everything is [now] within»,[92] Ezekiel's vision means something a little different and, in Macarius' eyes, even greater for the Christian. It is no longer the hope of an exterior vision which should drive the

[89] II.i.2 (Dörries 1:23–2:31; ET 37). Note that the soul is called «throne» here, together with «seat» and «dwelling place». Elsewhere Macarius will refer to it as «temple» (ναός), «church» (ἐκκλησία), »house» (οἶκος), »altar» (θυσιαστήριον), «tabernacle» (σκηνή), «palace» (παλάτιον), and «city» (πόλις). For discussion of these passages, including the idea of the soul as microcosm of both the heavenly and earthly Churches, see A. Golitzin, *Et introibo ad altare dei*: The Mystagogy of Dionysius Areopagita // *Analekta Blatadon* 59 (1994) 374–385; and idem, Temple and Throne of the Divine Glory… 120–127. For other appearances of Ezek 1 in the *Homilies*, see II.i.9 (Dörries 10:202–215; ET 42); xxxiii.2 (258:22–259:28; 202); and I.xxix.2.2 (Berthold I, 263:9–20), and note in the last the assimilation of the μονή of Jn 14:23 to Ezekiel's chariot. For a straight borrowing of the charioteer in Plato's *Phaedrus* (i.e., the intellect and not Christ God as charioteer), however, see II.xl.5 (Dörries 277:62–64: ET 215).

[90] Scholem, Major Trends… 79.

[91] See Quispel, Makarios, das Thomasevangelium… 9–13; and idem, Sein und Gestalt…, for Macarius' Jewish echoes, though Quispel nowhere addresses the specific matter of the *merkavah* in the *Homilies*.

[92] III.viii.1.5 (Desprez 144:50). The whole passage is playing on the contrasts of 2 Cor 3, ink and stone in opposition to Spirit and heart.

monks' desires and longing, but the promise of transfiguration from within. The soul itself is to become at once the chariot throne and, as Macarius goes on to explain, the soul's faculties are thus typified by the living creatures (*hayyot*) which support the *merkavah*. The soul is the true and intended dwelling place and seat of the Glory.[93] This again is functionally identical with Evagrius' understanding of Sinai and the «place» of the divine presence. Like Evagrius, too, Macarius does not simply moralize or ethicize the Glory out of effective existence. The Trinity itself is light, true and substantial, which can be known and seen within the soul in a real anticipation of eschatological transformation in the age to come.

VII. Concluding Remarks: Continuity and Discontinuity

In this harmony of emphasis on the consubstantial Trinity, on the formless light of the Godhead, and on the possibility of knowing the latter directly even in the present life, the homilist and Evagrius lend that shape to the ruling emphases of Eastern Christian spirituality and mysticism which obtains to the present day.[94] True, this late fourth century shift does constitute a discontinuity of sorts. It is in some respects a break with prior traditions that is comparable even to the discontinuity which Christianity itself represents with respect to the Second Temple matrix out of which it came. On the other hand, I also think it fair to say, first and together with Guy Stroumsa very recently,[95] that the newly exclusive stress on interiority in these writers is in harmony with a certain logic inherent in the Christian Gospel itself, and, second and this time rather in opposition to or at least as supplementing Stroumsa, that the break with the past is a little less sharp in the Christian East than in the

[93] II.i.3 (Dörries 2:51–67; ET:38): «The four living creatures that bore the chariot were a type of the leading faculties of the soul: ...the will, conscience, mind [νοῦς], and the power to love...The Rider, then, is carried by the chariot and the living creatures who are all eye or, in a way, he is carried by every soul that has become his throne and exists now as eye and light».

[94] «Evagrius established the categories [of Eastern Christian spirituality]; Macarius... provided the affective content», V. Desprez, Macaire // *DSp* 10. 39. I believe, however, that the «head» and «heart» contrast between Evagrius and Macarius reflected here is somewhat overdrawn. See on this point Golitzin, «Temple and Throne of the Divine Glory» 108–114. On Macarius' use of «body of the Glory» traditions, and his importance thus for later Eastern Christian thought, see A. Orlov, A. Golitzin, «Many Lamps are Lightened from the One»: Paradigms of the Transformational Vision in the Macarian Homilies // *VC* 55.3 (2001) 281–298; and cf. above, n. 61, on Evagrius' use of the same traditions.

[95] Stroumsa, Hidden Wisdom... 145–146, 156–159, and 164–167; and cf. idem, Ascèse et gnôse: aux origines de la spiritualité monastique // *RThom* 89 (1981) 557–573, esp. 566–572.

West of Augustine and the latter's heirs.[96] The divine light remains, as do the notes of transfiguration and of the commerce of heaven with earth even in the present life. The monks of Egypt who protested Theophilus' letter were doomed ultimately to lose their struggle, at least for that particular configuration of the traditions which they cherished. Yet the earlier emphases and hope did not disappear. The old apocalyptic texts of the Pseudepigrapha continued to be read, copied, and, I presume, valued by Eastern monks. Likewise, the hope of the *visio dei maiestatis* retained its central place and, I think, continued to be nourished by texts from Jewish antiquity.[97] The story of this continuity remains to be explored and charted. I hope that this paper has made some small contribution toward that enterprise, just as I hope, too, that it may serve as a signal of my own deep gratitude for the work of those Jewish and Christian scholars who have, since Scholem, begun to open a door toward the glimpse of wider vistas, and of deeper affinities between Jew and Christian, than had long been thought to be the case.

ABSTRACT

The article investigate the monastic anthropomorphites of Egypt seeing them as the heirs of an ancient, non-Hellenic, Jewish visionary tradition, a tradition rendered anachronistic by the theological settlement of Nicea. By examining certain works of fourth-century monasticism, the article seeks to trace the outlines of this tradition, both in its advocates and in its critics.

[96] Stroumsa, Hidden Wisdom... 109–110, and esp. the choice of Augustine as universal pattern for later Christian mysticism 132–146. But recall also the qualification above, n. 11, regarding John Cassian and the latter's successors in the Western tradition.

[97] See Himmelfarb, Ascent to Heaven... 99, asking why late antique and even medieval and post-medieval Christian monks continued to copy non-canonical literature (here the OT Pseudepigrapha), especially in the East, and cf. the same question posed more forcefully by R. A. Kraft, The Pseudepigrapha in Christianity // Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of the Jewish Pseudepigrapha / Ed. J. C. Reeves (Atlanta, 1994) 55–86, esp. 68–70. The answer, I suggest, is that the monks continued to find the experience of God they hoped to receive themselves mirrored in the ascent and vision stories of the saints of Israel, the as it were «grandfathers» of Christianity. This is precisely the assumption — i.e., what the prophets saw then we may see today — which opens Gregory Palamas' *Tomos* in defense of the Hesychasts of Mt. Athos in 1340/41. See the *Tomos of the Holy Mountain*, Greek in Nicodemus, Φιλοκαλία IV:188–189; ET: Ware *et alii*, *The Philokalia* IV:418–419; and for comment, J. R. Romanides, Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics // *GOTR* 6.2 (1960/1) 186–205 and 9.2 (1963/4) 225–270, esp. 194–205 and 257–262; together with A. Goltizin, «Earthly Angels and Heavenly Men»: The OT Pseudepigrapha, Nicetas Stethatos, and the Tradition of «Interiorized Apocalyptic» in Eastern Christian Ascetical and Mystical Literature // *DOP* (forthcoming).

Hieromonk Alexander (Golitzin)
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

DIONYSIUS AREOPAGITES IN THE WORKS OF SAINT GREGORY PALAMAS: ON THE QUESTION OF A «CHRISTOLOGICAL CORRECTIVE» AND RELATED MATTERS

I. Dionysius Areopagites, Gregory Palama: Scholarly Controversy and «Christological Correctives»

The works of Dionysius Areopagites have been controversial ever since Martin Luther's dismissal of him as *plus platonizans quam christianizans*, and particularly since the scholarly labors of Joseph Stiglmayr and Hugo Koch at the close of the 19th century demonstrated his incontestable fondness for the thought of Iamblichus of Chalcis and, especially, Proclus Diadochus.[1] The degree of that fondness and its compatibility or, more often, perceived incompatibility with Christian faith and the patristic tradition have been the primary focus of scholarly literature for the past hundred years.[2]

---

[1] H. Koch, Proklus als Quelle des Pseudo-Dionysius in der Lehre vom Bösen // *Philologus* 54 (1895) 438–454; J. Stiglmayr, Der Neuplatoniker Proklos als Vorlage des sog. Dionysius Areopagita in der Lehre vom Übel // *HJ* 16 (1895) 253–273 and 721–748. See also the latter's Das Aufkommen der Pseudo-Dionysischen Schriften und ihr Eindringen in die christliche Literatur bis zum Laterancouncil 649. Ein zweiter Beitrag zur Dionysius Frage // IV Jahresbericht des offentlichen Privatgymnasiums an der Stelle matutina zu Feldkirch (Feldkirch, 1895), which set the *ad quem* (486) and *a quo* (532) of Dionysius, together with its setting in Christian Syria, which have held the scholarly field to the present day. Koch's later monograph, Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita in seinen Beziehungen zum Neuplatonismus und Mysterienwesen (Mainz, 1900), set out the lexical and notional parallels between Dionysius and later Neoplatonist writers which, again, established the lines of scholarly research for the following century. In my quotations from the text of the *Corpus Dionysiacum*, I shall be citing the chapter and paragraph of his different works, followed by the column number in volume III of Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, then in parenthesis the page and line numbers from the critical text: Corpus Dionysiacum I: *De Divinibus Nominibus* / Ed. B. M. Suchla (Berlin—New York, 1990), and Corpus Dionysiacum II / Ed. G. Heil, A. M. Ritter (Berlin—New York, 1991) Vols. 33 and 36, respectively, of the Berlin corpus, PTS.

[2] The literature here is vast, so a few examples must do. For Dionysius as a poorly disguised pagan, see the following chiefly by Protestant scholars: H. F. Müller, Dio-

Some few scholars, notably Vladimir Lossky, Fr. John Romanides, and Andrew Louth, read Dionysius instead as fundamentally faithful to prior currents of patristic thought and a significant contributor to those who came after him, such as SS Maximus Confessor, Symeon New Theologian, Nicetas Stethatos, and Gregory Palamas.[3] My own conversion to this reading of the Areopagite came through exposure to the life of an Athonite monastery, Simonos Petras, and especially through the example and teaching of its abbot and elder, the Archimandrite Aemilianos. Thus the purpose of this essay: I propose to argue for both SS Dionysius and Gregory as within the ascetico-mystical tradition of Eastern Christianity.

---

nysios, Proklos, Plotinos. Ein historischer Beitrag zur neuplatonischen Philosophie (Münster—Westfalen, 1926[2]); A. Nygren, Agape and Eros / Tr. P. S. Watson (London, 1953); J.-M. Hornus, Quelques réflexions à propos du Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite et la mystique chrétienne en général // *RHPhR* 27 (1947) 37–63; J. Vanneste, Le mystère de Dieu (Brussels, 1959); R. Hathaway, Hierarchy and the Definition of Order in the Letters of Pseudo-Dionysius (The Hague, 1969); B. Brons, Gott und die Seienden: Untersuchungen zum Verhältnis von neuplatonisher Metaphysik und chrisfliche Tradition bei Dionysius Areopagita (Göttingen, 1976); S. Gersh, From Iamblichus to Erieugena: An Investigation of the Prehistory and Evolution of the Pseudo-Dionysian Tradition (Leiden, 1978); P. E. Rorem, Biblical and Liturgical Symbols within the Pseudo-Dionysian Synthesis (Toronto, 1984); idem, Pseudo-Dionysius: A Commentary on the Texts and an Introduction to their Influence (Oxford—New York, 1993); and idem with J. Lamoreaux, John of Scythopolis and the Dionsysian Corpus: Annotating the Areopagite (Oxford, 1998). For, however, a very positive evaluation of Neoplatonism's potential as a vehicle for Christian discourse, together with a spirited defense of its place in Dionysius as a legitimately Christian thinker, see E. J. D. Perl, Symbol, Sacrament, and Hierarchy in Saint Dionysius the Areopagite // *GOTR* 39.3–4 (1994) 311–356; and idem, The Metaphysics of Love in Dionysius the Areopagite // *Journal of Neoplatonic Studies* 6.1 (1997) 45–73.

[3] See V. N. Lossky, The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church (repr. Cambridge—London, 1968); J. S. Romanides, Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics // *GOTR* 6.2 (1960–1961) 186–205 and 9.2 (1963–1964) 225–270; A. Louth, Denys the Areopagite (Wilton, CT, 1989); A. Golitzin, Anarchy vs. Hierarchy? Dionysius Areopagita, Symeon New Theolgian, Nicetas Stethatos, and their Common Roots in Ascetical Tradition // *SVTQ* 38.2 (1994) 131–179; and idem, *Et introibo ad altare dei*: The Mystagogy of Dionysius Areopagita, with Special Reference to its Predecessors in the Eastern Christian Tradition (Θεσσαλονίκη, 1994) (Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων, 59). For Roman Catholic scholars, see esp. R. Roques, L'univers dionysien (Paris, 1954); the succession of articles in *Scholastik* 20–24 (1949); 25 (1950), 27 (1952), 28 (1953) and 29 (1954) by O. von Semmelroth; H. U. von Balthasar, Herrlichkeit: Eine theologische Aesthetik (Einsiedeln, 1962) Vol. II. 147–214 (quite the most perceptive of any Western scholar); and most recently, Y. de Andia, Henôsis: l'union à Dieu chez Denys l'Aréopagite (Leiden—Köln—New York, 1996).

The question of Dionysius' specific relationship to the thought of St. Gregory marks another arena of scholarly contention. That there was a relationship is undeniable. Significant sections of, particularly, St. Gregory's *Triads* are devoted to his debate with Barlaam the Calabrian over the proper interpretation of the *Corpus Areopagiticum*.[4] What is at issue in the contemporary debate, however, are two closely related questions: first, was St. Gregory a faithful and accurate interpreter of Dionysius; and, second, what does the answer to that question say about either Dionysius, or Gregory, or both? For several Western scholars, Palamas was indeed a faithful disciple of the *Areopagitica*, but this is then held up as proof that the Doctor of Hesychasm was himself in thrall to the same lightly Christianized version of pagan Neoplatonism as typified his master.[5] For others, again Western, St. Gregory, in contrast to — say — St. Thomas Aquinas, clumsily distorted Dionysius' delicate adjustment of pagan discourse to Christian revelation in order to arrive at the lamentable and hitherto unheard of distinction between the divine essence and energies.[6] In the eyes of still a third group, it is Dionysius who is the anomaly, a «lonely meteorite» in the night sky of patristic thought,[7] yet whose authority, based on the apostolic pseudonym and specifically invoked by Barlaam, compelled St. Gregory to assault and alter the Areopagite's system under the guise of interpreting it. My own beloved teacher and patron, Fr. John Meyendorff of blessed memory, was the origin of this third

[4] See and contrast the analyses of Dionysius' presence in Gregory by J. Meyendorff, A Study of Gregory Palamas / Tr. G. Lawrence (London, 1964) 187–202, and by Romanides, Notes… 250–262. See also the extensive (over two dozen) references to Dionysius in R. E. Sinkiewicz' painstaking analysis of the early phase of Palamas' debate with Barlaam: The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God in the Early Writings of Barlaam the Calabrian // *Medieval Studies* 44 (1982) 181–242. For the text of Palamas himself and the Dionysian presence in the Triads, see the index in volume I of the edition by P. Chrestou, Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ· Συγγράμματα (Thessalonica, 1962) 707–709.

[5] See, for example, G. Podskalsky, Gotteschau und Inkarnation. Zur Bedeutung der Heilsgeschichte bei Gregorios Palamas // *OCP* 35 (1969); B. Schutze, Grundfragen des theologischen Palamismus // *Ostkirchliche Studien* 24 (1975) 105–135; R. D. Williams, The Philosophical Structures of Palamism // *Eastern Churches Review* 9 (1977) 27–44; and most recently, J. Nadal, Denys l'Aréopagite dans les traités de Grégoire Akindynos // Denys l'Aréopagite et sa postérité en Orient et en Occident / Ed. Y. de Andia (Paris, 1997) 535–563.

[6] This is the impression I receive from, perhaps most notably, E. von Ivanka, Plato Christianus (Einsiedeln, 1964) 228–289.

[7] See the summary of Dionysius' intluence or, rather, perceived non-intluence in the Christian East by P. Sherwood and A. Rayez in *DSp* 3. 286–317; and cf. I. Hausherr, Les grands courrants de la spiritualité orientale // *OCP* 1 (1935) 124–125. I borrow the phrase, «lonely meteorite», from J. Vanneste, Is the Mysticism of Pseudo-Dionysius Genuine? // *IPQ* 3 (1963) 288–289.

current.[8] His thesis of a Palamite «Christological corrective» applied to the Areopagite has since been picked up and disseminated widely in the scholarly literature, including most recently Professor Adolf Ritter's contribution to the collection of essays on Dionysius edited and published recently by Ysabel de Andia of the Sorbonne.[9]

Professor Ritter's article will serve as a springboard and foil for the remainder of this essay. As is to be expected from so accomplished a scholar, a co-editor of the critical text of the *Corpus Areopagiticum*, it is an admirably compact and elegant defense of Meyendorff's thesis. So much so, in fact, that Ritter by the end of his presentation believes he has demonstrated that the «Christological corrective» is «thoroughly incontestable» (*völlig unbestreitbar*).[10] I wish to register, first, my view that the «corrective» is not only not «incontestable», but that it is an illusion, a scholarly invention. The origins of this theological phantom lie, second, in a widespread, indeed practically universal misapprehension of the meaning and function of the Dionysian hierarchies as the unfortunate result of dependence on late pagan Neoplatonism.

[8] See again *Study of Gregory Palamas*, loc. cit., and the thought is repeated continuously in Meyendorff's many other publications wherever the subject of Dionysius and Gregory (or Maximus) come up. Romanides, Notes… 250–257, pinpoints this expression in Meyendorff's *Study* in order to argue against it. Among the more important supporters of Meyendorff's hypothesis, I would include Sinkiewicz' The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God… (see above, n. 4). Thus, at the beginning, middle, and end of his otherwise illumining article, he refers to Dionysius as, respectively, Barlaam's principle source (p. 189), the «ground» of Barlaam's theological approach (215), and, again, the source of the Calabrian's «platonizing anthropology» (239). This may be true so far as Barlaam understood Dionysius, but I would argue — as did Palamas — that the latter's opponent had misread his primary source. Here I might point out that, while Sinkiewicz dutifully notes each of Barlaam's many citations of and allusions to Dionysius (see, e.g., pp. 191, 193, 195, 203, 205, 210, 212, 213, 214, 216, 218, etc.), he does not so consistently offer the same service to Gregory, whose remarks, reported in pp. 226–228 of the article, are packed with allusions to Dionysius that Sinkiewicz mostly overlooks — perhaps most notably Palamas' insistence on apophatic theology as denoting or presupposing the experience of God, for which he alludes to *Divine Names* 2.9: *ou monon mathôn, alla kai pathôn ta theia*, thus Gregory: *ou mé gnontes, alla kai pathontes ta theia* (quoted in full by Sinkiewicz on p. 228, n. 218, but without the Dionysian reference). Overall, Sinkiewicz appears to operate — wrongly, in my view — throughout with the presupposition (shared with Meyendorff) that Barlaam's is the more correct reading of the Areopagite.

[9] A. M. Ritter, Gregor Palamas als Leser des Dionysius Pseudo-Areopagita // Denys l'Aréopagite et sa postérité… 565–579. For another, slightly less recent example of Meyendorff's influence, see P. Wesche, Christological Doctrine and Liturgical Interpretation in Pseudo-Dionysius // *SVTQ* 33.1 (1989) 53–73.

[10] Ritter, Gregor Palamas als Leser… 579.

Professor Ritter is here fully within the scholarly mainstream.[11] Palamas, however, was not part of that mainstream, but was instead one (and not the only) fourteenth-century instance of a continuous, primarily monastic reading of the Areopagite which correctly understood the latter as himself drawing on prior currents in the ascetico-mystical, liturgical, and theological literature of the Christian East. Dionysius, in short, is properly understood as bracketed by the tradition out of which he came and within which he continued to be read. The Eastern monks have always known this. St. Gregory was no exception. It is here, in this second point, that we find both the truth and the falsehood of Ritter's assertion early on in his article that Dionysius «influenced, but never dominated» Eastern Christian thought. This statement is true exactly for the reason just stated, and false because it presumes that the *Areopagitica* represented an anomaly — the «lonely meteorite» — which sought to introduce things novel and foreign to the tradition.

Professor Ritter is, however, correct in noting that St. Gregory does bring something new to the Areopagite, though I will argue, third, that this addition is much less any specifically «Christological corrective» than it is the exploitation of certain possibilities inherent in both Dionysius and in earlier patristic and ascetic writers, and that these possibilities had already been exploited by SS Symeon the New Theologian and Nicetas Stethatos three hundred years before Palamas. To these two Eastern saints, St. Gregory also appears to have added, according to the very recent work of another German scholar, Reinhard Flogaus, the fruits of his reading in Maximus Planudes' translation into Greek of St. Augustine of Hippo's *De trinitate*.[12] The last observation will provide us with some interesting points of comparison between the ways in which two quite different Church Fathers, Dionysius and the great bishop of Hippo Regius, were received by, respectively, the medieval Latin West and the Greek East.

II. St. Gregory and the Dionysian Hierarchies

A. The Angels as Elders

I shall come to my third point a little later, but for now allow me to turn to my first two which bear on the perceived necessity of the «Christological corrective» which St. Gregory is supposed to have supplied in order to counteract what Fr. Georges Florovsky once referred to as the «staircase principle» of the Dionysian hierarchies.[13] Professor Ritter offers two sets of texts

[11] See above, n. 2.

[12] R. Flogaus, Palamas and Barlaam Revisited: A Reassessment of East and West in the Hesychast Controversy of Fourteenth Century Byzantium // *SVTQ* 42.1 (1998) 1–32.

[13] G. Florovsky, The Byzantine Ascetical and Spiritual Fathers (Belmont, MA, 1987) 221.

as proof of this contention in the concluding section of his article.[14] From Dionysius he selects *Celestial Hierarchy* 4.2–4, on the angelic mediation of revelation, *Divine Names* 1.5, on the ineffability of the angels' vision of God, and, most especially, *Celestial Hierarchy* 8.2 on the principle of hierarchical mediation. The last in particular is worth quoting in full:

> The divine source of all order has established the all-embracing principle that beings of the first rank receive enlightenment from the Godhead through beings of the first rank.[15]

Against this ostensible assertion of «created intermediaries» (*geschaffene Zwischenglieder)*, Ritter points to two texts from St. Gregory. The first comes from *Triads* 2.3 on the vision of the «sacred light» (*phôs hieron*), and in particular 2.3.28–30, where Palamas sets out to explain exactly how the passages Ritter cites are to be understood, in response to Barlaam's apparent advocacy of a strictly mediated vision of God. Ritter clearly thinks Barlaam's reading of Dionysius is the correct one, and quotes in opposition St. Gregory's assertion in *Triads* 2.3.29 that Christ «has made all things new», and that therefore only now, in the New Testament dispensation, are visions of God (*theoptiai*) available to us immediately, i.e., without the created mediation of the angels:

> Not... in mediated fashion and through other [beings], but [they are] rather immediate and self-manifest... not coming conveyed by beings of the first rank to those of the second. For the Lord of lords is not subject to the laws of creation...[16]

Here, the professor declares, we find a «clear contradiction [*klarem Widerspruch*] to Dionysius' emphatically repeated [hierarchical] principle», one which is precisely and expressly a corrective based on the Gospel of Jesus Christ.[17]

This juxtaposition of texts seems to serve Ritter's point very well, indeed, and is at first glance quite impressive. St. Gregory does appear to be expressly contradicting Dionysius: «*not*...by beings of the first rank to those of the

[14] Ritter, Palamas als Leser… 575–579. Perhaps I should note at this point, since I shall be attacking his analysis of Dionysius in what follows, that most of Professor Ritter's article displays an extraordinarily warm and genuine appreciation of both Palamas and Orthodox theology. It is almost exclusively in this last section that I have difficulities with him — but then, I have the same problems with many contemporary Orthodox theologians as well.

[15] *PG* 3. 240D (34, 14–16). English translation by C. Liubheid, in Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works / Ed. P. E. Rorem (New York, 1987) 168. Unless otherwise stated, all subsequent translations from Dionysius will be my own.

[16] *Triads* 2.2.29, Chrestou, Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ· Συγγράμματα… I. 563, ll. 18–20.

[17] Ritter, Palamas als Leser… 576.

second». Closer inspection of this section of the *Triads*, however, together with another look at Dionysius himself against the background of earlier ascetical literature, will reveal that Palamas' contradiction is in fact nothing of the kind. St. Gregory is first of all instead correcting the mis-reading of the Areopagite which Ritter (and Meyendorff) effectively share with Barlaam. As Romanides pointed out some years ago, neither Palamas nor Dionysius believed that the great theophanies of either the past (to the saints of Israel), or of the present (to the saints of the New Covenant) took or take place through angelic mediation, but rather that the angels served both then and now to explain and interpret the *visio dei luminis*.[18] This is exactly the point which St. Gregory is at pains to make in *Triads* 2.3.28 and 30, which is to say, in the sections immediately preceding and succeeding the passage which Ritter quotes. Gabriel, in *Triads* 2.3.28, did not cause the Word of God to be incarnate of the Theotokos, nor did the angels cause the the Glory of God to appear to the shepherds near Bethlehem. Rather, the Archangel explained to the Panagia the significance of what was taking place in her, while the angel messenger announced the meaning — i.e., the occasion of the Savior's birth — of the divine light's appearance to the shepherds, and the angelic choirs shared with them the *Gloria in excelsis*.[19] It is difficult for me not to think that Gregory had in mind here a related passage in Dionysius' *Celestial Hierarchy* 4.4 regarding, first, the Virgin:

> The most divine Gabriel...explained [lit., initiated into the mystery: *emystagôgei*] to Mary how the divine mystery of the God's taking form would come to pass in her...;[20]

and then the shepherds:

> ...another angel brought the good news to the shepherds who, because of their quiet life [lit., silence: *hesychia*] withdrawn [*anachôrései*] from the crowd, had somehow been purified. And with him [i.e., the angel] «a multitude of the heavenly host» passed on to those on earth that greatly renounced song of praise.[21]

Note here that Dionysius associates the shepherds with specifically ascetical virtues through his use of the terms *anachôrésis* and *hésychia*, turning them thus into hesychasts — effectively into monks, exemplars of «the angelic life» — and visionaries, seers of the divine light and concelebrants of

[18] Romanides, Notes... 257.

[19] *Triads* 2.2.28, Chrestou, Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ· Συγγράμματα... I. 562–563.

[20] *PG* 3. 181B (22, 25–23:5).

[21] *PG* 3. 181BC (23:6–9). ET: Liubheid, *Pseudo-Dionysius*... 158 (slightly amended).

the heavenly liturgy.[22] Palamas clearly understand the relevance of this passage to his own enterprise, as evidenced by what I take to be his allusion to it in *Triads* 2.3.28.

In *Triads* 2.3.30, St. Gregory spells out the distinction between mediated *knowledge* and direct *vision*:

> For while in most cases you might find that the grace of knowledge is given by intermediaries, the majority of God's [biblical] appearances are direct manifestations [i.e., of God himself, without intermediary].

His illustration of this principle is Moses on Sinai. The latter was indeed given the Law «through angels, but not the vision itself [of God], rather the interpretation [lit., «initiation»: *myésin*] of the vision [came through angels]».[23] This is, again, exactly the distinction that Dionysius assumes. In *Celestial Hierarchy* 4.2, he makes the same point of angelic mediation of the Law, as well as of the angels teaching the patriarchs before Moses,[24] but it is the latter who is the express recipient and exemplar of immediate contact with God in the justly famous lines from *Mystical Theology* 1.3, which feature the God-seer's ascent into the mysterious darkness of «unknowing» atop Sinai — a darkness which, be it noted, Dionysius takes care on two other occasions to identify with the «unapproachable light» (*aprositon phôs*) of I Tim 6:16.[25] St. Gregory, incidentally, picks up on Dionysius' identification of the two when the former is at pains to make precisely the same point to Barlaam about the supposed darkness of apophatic theology in *Triads* 2.3.50–51.[26]

Elsewhere, in *Celestial Hierarchy* 13, Dionysius devotes an entire, long chapter to the vision of Isaiah 6:1–7. Here once again we find an articulation of the same hierarchical principle which Meyendorff and Ritter believe casts doubt on the Areopagite's genuinely Christian credentials and so places him in opposition to Palamas:

> Thus, according to the same principle of natural good order, the divine source of all visible and invisible good order manifests the brilliance of its own outpouring of light in blessed streams, appearing first of all to the

[22] As indicated by P. Rorem in his note on this passage: The shepherds' «withdrawl» seems presented as almost a monastic virtue // Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works… 158, n.60. I myself would omit the «seems» and «almost».

[23] *Triads* 2.2.30, Chrestou, Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ· Συγγράμματα… I. 565, ll. 2–6.

[24] *PG* 3. 180B (21, 15–20).

[25] On Moses' entry in the cloud, see *Mystical Theology* I.3, *PG* 3. 1000B–1001A (143:8–144:15), and for the identification of the γνόφος with the ἀπρόσιτον φῶς, see *Divine Names* 7.2, 869A (196:11–12) and Epistle V, 1073A (162:3–4). For comment, see A. Golitzin, Revisiting the «Sudden»: Epistle III in the *Corpus Dionysiacum* // *SP* 37 (2001) 482–491, here 484 ff.

[26] Chrestou, Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ· Συγγράμματα… I. 582–584.

> highest beings, while those beings who come after them partake through them of the divine ray.[27]

Does this mean that he understands the «divine ray» to pass through the highest angels to those below — and so ultimately to us — as through, so to speak, a series of «membranes», as this passage appears to suggest? It does not, and that it does not is made clear a little below. First, Dionysius remarks that the highest angels, after God Himself, direct (or «guide», or «show the way»: *hégountai*) those below them to all divine *knowledge* (*theognôsia*), and to all activity which is in imitation of God (*theomimésia*).[28] This puts quite a different complexion on the preceding passage and squares neatly, I think, with the distinction we saw St. Gregory making above between knowledge and vision. It is borne out, secondly, in Dionysius' analysis of Isaiah's vision itself. The prophet was *guided* by an angel:

> ...through one of the...angels who are set over us, and by his illumining *guidance*, [*cheiragôgia*] [Isaiah] was raised up to that vision, according to which he saw — speaking, as it were, in symbols — the highest beings established under God, and with God, and around God, and [he saw], transcendently established in the midst of the powers subordinate to Him, that summit which ineffably transcends both them [i.e., «the powers»] and all things whatsoever.[29]

Isaiah, in short, is led and guided by a guardian angel up to the vision of the throne of God, of the angels which surround it, and of the Most High Himself. The vision is direct, both of God and of the angelic liturgy — *tés hieras autôn eulabeias*[30] — which Dionysius discusses in some detail a little below. The angel guide then explains to the prophet what the latter is seeing:

> The angel, so far as possible, gave shape to the vision for the theologian [i.e., the prophet] by sharing with him his own sacred knowledge, and he initiated him [or, «instructed him»: *emystagôgeito*] into that divine and most precious hymnody [a reference, presumably, to the «thrice-holy» of Isa 6:3].[31]

---

[27] *Celestial Hierarchy* 13.3, *PG* 3. 301BC (45:14–18). I think myself that Dionysius' purpose in elaborating at such length on this particular theophany might have had something to do with the circulation of pseudepigraphical works such as *The Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah*, whose influence he is — in part — anxious to counteract. For speculation on his own foray into pseudepigraphy as perhaps determined by the influence of works such as *The Martyrdom* (and many others), see Golitzin, Revisiting the «Sudden»… 489, n. 33, and at greater length in idem, Dionysius Areopagita: A Christian Mysticism? // *Pro Ecclesia* (forthcoming).

[28] *PG* 3. 304A (46:7–8).

[29] *Celestial Hierarchy* 13.4, *PG* 3. 304C (46:23–47:3).

[30] Ibid. 305A (47:20) for τῆς ἱερᾶς αὐτῶν εὐλαβείας.

[31] Ibid. 305AB (48:1–4).

The pattern of an angel guide leading the seer to a vision of the heavenly throne and liturgy, and then explaining its meaning, is well known to us from the Jewish apocalyptic literature of the late Second Temple era, as, for example, in the canonical book of Daniel 7 ff., as well as in such Old Testament Pseudepigrapha as *1* and *2 Enoch*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, and many others. It also appears in specifically Christian writings, in the Revelation of John in the New Testament, or in the early second-century pseudepigraphon, *The Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah*.[32] In every case, the vision is direct and the angel is present in order to aide and instruct. This literature is part of the background of both Dionysius and Palamas, particularly given the fact that it was also of continuous interest to Eastern monks, as signaled by the great number of medieval manuscripts of these ancient documents which have down to us.[33] More specifically, however, as the vocabulary which Dionysius deploys for the angels' mediatory function should suggest to us — mystagogues, teachers, guides and directors (*hégoumenoi* — in short, abbots!) — his own presumption is clearly of a monastic setting. We are reminded in fact, and not accidentally, of the spiritual fathers and elders who appear so prominently in our earliest monastic texts, as in, for example, the *Vitae* of Anthony and Pachomius, the *Gerontikon*, the *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*, the works of Evagrius Ponticus, and others. Indeed, as I have argued elsewhere, the *geron* or spiritual father is to a striking degree assimilated to the figure and role of the *angelus interpres* of the ancient apocalypses in both this earliest monastic literature, and thereafter to the present day.[34] Dionysius and

[32] See esp. M. Himmelfarb, Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses (Oxford, 1993) 3–46, and, more generally on apocalyptic as related to mysticism, C. Rowland, The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity (New York, 1982).

[33] See R. A. Kraft, The Pseudepigrapha in Christianity // Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha / Ed. J. C. Reeves (Atlanta, 1994) 55–86; together with A. Golitzin, «Earthly Angels and Heavenly Men»: The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Nicetas Stethatos, and the Tradition of «Interiorized Apocalyptic» in Eastern Christian Ascetical and Mystical Literature // *DOP* (forthcoming).

[34] Golitzin, «Earthly Angels and Heavenly Men»…; cf. also in existing published literature: P. Brown, The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity // *Journal of Roman Studies* 61 (1971) 80–101; H. Dörries, Theologie des Makarios/Symeon (Göttingen, 1978) 336–366; M. S. Burrows, On the Visibility of God in the Holy Man: A Reconsideration of the Role of the Apa in the Pachomian *Vitae* // *VC* 41 (1987) 11–33; S. A. Harvey, Sense of a Stylite: Perspectives on Symeon the Elder // *VC* 42 (1988) 376–394; and G. Bunge, Geistliche Vaterschaft: Christliche Gnosis bei Evagrios Pontikos (Regensburg, 1988) Esp. 33–36, 40–50, and 69–72. None of these bring up specifically the comparison with the «Angel of the Presence» in apocalyptic literature, e.g., Jaoel in the Apocalypse of Abraham, but once noted the resemblance between the latter and the charismatic elder of monastic literature is unmistakable,

Palamas are both representatives of this continuum, a fact which is illustrated with, I think, striking force in a passage from the work of a famous disciple of Evagrius in the early fifth century. In the preferatory letter, addressed to Lausus the Chamberlain, which opens his *Lausiac History*, Palladius of Heliopolis writes approvingly of his correspondent's desire for instruction:

> You desire to be taught the words of true edification. For the God of all alone is untaught, since He is self-existent and was preceded by no other being; all others are taught, since they were made and created. The first order of beings have their learning from the most high Trinity, the second learns from the first, the third from the second, and so on down to the least. Those who are higher in knowledge and virtue teach the lower.[35]

Given this passage, might we not say that the lines which I quoted above from *Celestial Hierarchy* 13, and which both Professor Ritter and I cited from *Celestial Hierarchy* 8.2, are no more obviously a paraphrase of the pagan Neoplatonism of, for example, Iamblichus than they are of the Christian monk and predecessor of Dionysius, Palladius? The passages are so close as to argue for a match, down to and including an even more explicit expression of the triadic form, so dear to Dionysius, than we found in the latter's texts cited above, together with the language of «firsts» (*prota*), «seconds» (*deutera*), and, here, «thirds» (*trita*). Neither for Dionysius nor for Palladius do the angels stand «between» us and God, at least not in the sense of their blocking our direct access to Him and to the experience of His light. The hierarchical principle has nothing whatsoever to do with the mediated *experience* of God, but rather with the leading up to, explanation, and testing of that experience. It is, in short, a fundamentally monastic construct that we confront in the Dionysian angelology. The angelic hierarchy is nothing so much for him as it is a series of progressively more illumined holy elders. If we find the *angelus interpres* in the fourth-century holy man and thereafter, then, equally, the angels can and do appear here as *gerontes* or *startzi*. Dionysius is in any case fully «on the same wavelength» as Palladius before him and St. Gregory after him. The single aspect in which he differs from the other two is in his, so to speak, ecclesiastical emphasis, which emerges elsewhere particularly in his overall — though not entirely consistent — effort to identify the

---

thus see Stethatos' account of the New Theologian's heavenly vision of Symeon the Pious in Un grand mystique byzantin: Vie de Syméon le nouveau théologien / Ed. I. Hausherr (Rome, 1928) Esp. chps. 5 (pp. 8–10) and 90 (124), and cf. *Apoc. Abr* 10:3–16. For a contemporary instance of the angel guide, see the story of Papa Tikhon the Russian in: The Living Witness of the Holy Mountain: Contemporary Voices from Mount Athos / Tr. with introd. and notes by A. Golitzin (South Canaan, 1996) 142.

[35] «To Lausus», in The Lausiac History / Ed. C. Butler. Vol. II (Cambridge, 1903) 7. ET: The Lausiac History / Tr. and annotated by R. T. Meyer (New York, 1964) (Ancient Chritian Writers, 34) 21.

charismatic holy man with the bishop, or «hierarch». This difference, I might also note, was and continues to be heartily approved by Eastern bishops, beginning with Dionysius' earliest commentator, John of Scythopolis. On the other hand, Eastern monks, including St. Gregory, have just as uniformly and steadfastly (perhaps we might even say, charitably!) ignored it.[36]

B. Hierarchy as the Mirror and Shaper of the Soul

Palladius' use of *taxis* just above, together with the importance which that word has for Dionysius and his understanding of hierarchy, leads me to the second set of texts which Professor Ritter adduces in his proof of a Palamite «Christological corrective». These are the *One Hundred and Fifty Chapters*, written later in Palamas' life, and in particular *Chapters* 36–40, where St. Gregory presents the image of God in every human being as the *imago trinitatis*, composed of intellect, reason, and soul (*nous*, *logos*, and *psyché*).[37] Ritter believers that this section comprises a «silent corrective» (*stillschweigende Korretur*) addressed to the Dionysian *Zwischenglieder* by virtue of its implicit stress on Christ as offering us direct access to divinity. He cites in particular *Chapter* 40 on the soul as called to love God, neighbor, «and to both know and preserve its own worth, and, as it were, truly to love itself». According to Ritter, this is «an even more powerful "Christological corrective" taken against Dionysius' teaching on the hierarchies» than what we have seen so far, since it sets the *taxis* of the human soul above the ranks of angels (citing *Chapters* 38–39), such that the human being reflects in him- or herself «the image of the immanent Trinity», with the human soul becoming thus a «*Mikrokosmos*» of the Trinity's saving processions, or *proodoi*[38] Here then, the professor concludes, is the «Christological corrective» as «thoroughly incontestable», proof that vindicates Meyendorff's thesis over such of its critics as, most notably (and a target of Ritter's article throughout), John Romanides.

I must acknowledge that this comparison between SS Dionysius and Gregory is correct on two counts. Dionysius nowhere to my knowledge either reckons human beings higher than the angels or voices any explicit affirmation of the soul as the *imago trinitatis*, and the latter in spite of his obvious affection for triads of practically every other description. In both regards, however, he is scarcely unique among earlier patristic writers. The soul as *imago trinitatis* was not widely exploited in the fourth century, nor for some

[36] For a sketch of this differing reception of Dionysius among Eastern bishops, on the one hand, and monks, on the other, see Golitzin, *Et introibo ad altare dei*... 401–413.

[37] Ritter, Palamas als Leser… 577–578, citing especially *Chp* 40, in the edition of Sinkiewicz, Gregory Palamas: The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters… 126 and 128 (Greek text).

[38] Ritter, Palamas als Leser… 578.

time thereafter.[39] In developing it here, St. Gregory is at once drawing on sources in the Greek tradition which are much closer to him chronologically than Dionysius, and on another source outside of that tradition, of which more anon. I recall one fourth-century writer, the Macarian homilist, who does sound quite like Palamas' exaltation of the *axia* and *taxis* of the soul, but Macarius makes no effort to establish an analogy between the soul and the Holy Trinity.[40] The only place where I know of Dionysius using these two words, worth (*axia*) and order (*taxis*), in connection with the soul occurs in his *Epistle* VIII, addressed to the monk Demophilus, where the Areopagite instructs his correspondent as follows:

> «Assign what is deserving [*ta kat'axian*] to reason [*logos*], and to the incensive faculty [*thymos*] and to appetite [*epithymia*], and see to it that your [interior] order [*taxis*] is not wronged, but let reason which is superior rule over the [faculties] subordinate [to it, i.e., to reason].[41]

Here the question is not of the soul's worth or rank, but of the proper ordering of its inner faculties, with reason called to rule over the incensive faculty and appetite. If this seems and is pretty normal stuff, whether for pagan Greeks ever since Plato's *Phaedrus*, or for Christian writers making use of the Platonic tradition, it is nonetheless significant that Dionysius uses *taxis* here to refer to the *inner ordering* of the soul. In the particular context of *Epistle* VIII, where Demophilus has acted in such a way as «to overturn» the Church's «God-given order», *tén theoparadoton taxin... anatrepesthai*,[42] by daring to enter the sanctuary and lay hands on the «holy things», the *outer order* (*taxis*) of the Church hierarchy has been upset precisely because this particular monk's *inner order* (*taxis*) had likewise been disturbed and, indeed, overturned — as Dionysius is at pains to point out at length in his Epistle's opening praise of the «meekness» of the great Godseers of old,[43] here in sharp contrast to Demophilus' prideful arrogance.

---

[39] It does of course appear on occasion, almost in passing, e.g., in Gregory of Nyssa's *Great Catechetical Oration*, or, in the form in which it appears in Palamas (and, earlier, is taken up by Symeon New Theologian and Nicetas, see below n. 53) — λόγος-νοῦς-πνεῦμα (ψυχή), — in Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 23.11 (*PG* 23. 1164) and 31.33 (*PG* 36. 172). I am grateful to J. A. McGuckin, Perceiving Light from Light in Light (*Oration* 31.3): The Trinitarian Theology of St. Gregory the Theologian // *GOTR* 39.1 (1994) 7–32, here 23 and n.70, for this reference.

[40] See, for example, Homily XXVI of Collection III, in Pseudo-Macaire: Oeuvres spirituelles. I: Homilies propres à la *Collection III* / Ed. V. Desprez (SC, 275) (1980) 278: Μέγα γὰρ καὶ τίμιον καὶ εὐγενὲς καὶ ἐράσμιον τὸ τῆς νοερᾶς καὶ λογικῆς οὐσίας τῆς ψυχῆς ἀξίωμα τυγχάνει.

[41] Epistle 8.3 // *PG* 3. 1093A (182:6–8).

[42] Ibid. 1088C (176:3).

[43] Ibid. 1084B–85C (171:3–173:13). The stress on meekness, πραότης, in relation to the vision of God surely finds its primary biblical roots in Nu 12:3–8 (LXX):

I trouble with this seemingly trivial and unrelated episode in the *corpus* because, examined carefully, it reveals something about Dionysius' understanding of hierarchy which Professor Ritter has overlooked — along, I might add, with practically everyone else in modern times — and this is that, for the Areopagite, the outer ordering of «our hierarchy», *hé kath' hémas hierarchia*, by which he means the ranks and orders of clergy and laity as these appear pre-eminently in the Church's worship, is properly to be reflected in the inner ordering of the soul. Put another way, and borrowing indeed one of Professor Ritter's own words just above, «hierarchy» in the *Corpus Dionysiacum* is rightly to be understood both macrocosmically, as applying to the Church, and microcosmically, as applying to the soul. The latter, in short, is the microcosm of the Church. I have made this argument both briefly and at considerable length elsewhere,[44] so I shall not dwell on it here save to note that Dionysius himself makes this point expressly when, at the very beginning of his labors in *Celestial Hierarchy* 1.3, he states that the ranks (*diakosméseis*) of the Church (the different clerical and lay orders), are an *eikôn* or *typos* of the obviously inner, «harmonious and ordered» state or condition (*hexis*) of the soul which is «set in order (*tetagmené*) for divine things».[45]

«Our hierarchy» is also something more than a merely passive reflection of the well-ordered soul. It is not inert, but is rather itself a force or power which is — or should be — shaping the soul. As Dionysius puts it in *Celestial Hierarchy* 3.1, «Hierarchy is a certain sacred order [*taxis*] ... which is in process of being likened [*aphomoioumené*] to the form of God [*to theoeides*]».[46] If the last is a statement about the «macrocosmic» aspect of hierarchy, that is, the (heavenly and earthly) Church at worship, then a paragraph later he addresses the microcosm, the soul or individual Christian, when he writes of the aim or goal (*skopos*) of hierarchy as:

Moses, «the meekest of men», alone is accorded the vision of the divine form (in the LXX, the divine glory). Dionysius' passage here is also quite strikingly reminiscent of Evagrius Ponticus, down to the same examples of meekness in Moses, David, Job, and preeminently the Lord Jesus Himself. See G. Bunge on the centrality of meekness for Evagrius, *Geistliche Vaterschaft* 27–30, and esp. 42–44 on meekness — quite like Dionysius addressing Demophilus — as the necessary precondition for the *visio dei*. I take this as yet one more indication that the Areopagite is speaking out of a fundamentally traditional, Eastern Christian ascetical milieu. On the term, *taxis*, as already a *terminus technicus* for the inward ordering of the soul in early monastic literature, see G. Gould, The Desert Fathers on Monastic Community (Oxford, 1993) 151–152.

[44] At length, see Golitzin, *Et introibo ad altare dei*... 77–231, and more briefly, idem, Hierarchy versus Anarchy?... 131–179.

[45] *PG* 3. 121D–124A (9:4–5).

[46] Ibid. 164D (17:3–4).

> ...gazing unswervingly at His [God's] most divine beauty, and, so far as possible, shaping and perfecting its celebrants as divine images [*agalmata theia*], as most transparent and spotless mirrors, as recipients of the primordial and divine light... who also reflect the latter in turn to those who come after...;[47]

and, a little below:

> Perfection for each of those who have been apportioned [a place in] hierarchy is, according to the measure of each, to be led up to the imitation of God and, what is yet more divine, to become, as the scriptures put it, a «co-worker of God» [*theou synergon genesthai*] and, so far as possible, to receive in oneself and show forth the divine energy.[48]

In these statements, it seems to me that we find something very close indeed to what Professor Ritter understands St. Gregory to be talking about in the latter's *Chapters* 36–40: the shining forth of God's saving activity, here *energeia*, from the sanctified soul in fulfillment of the latter as the divine image or, to use Dionysius' lexicon from the passage cited above, the divine *agalma*. Ritter is correct about Palamas, but fails to see that the Doctor of Hesychasm and the Areopagite are here functionally identical. At this point, too, I should note that St. Gregory makes a very similar argument for Dionysius' hierarchic understanding in *Triads* 2.3.73–74, where he analyzes *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* 1.3.[49] Against Barlaam, Palamas rightly understands the *skopos* of the Dionysian hierarchy as assimilation to and union with God, as embracing in fact the experience of God through the keeping of the commandments, most especially the commandment of love. Save the two points I noted at the beginning of this section, there is next to nothing then in Palamas on the *imago dei* (at least as cited by Ritter) which is not in Dionysius. As Romanides observed forty years ago, St. Gregory is a better and more certain interpreter of Dionysius than the latter's modern critics.[50] Nor should this come as a surprise, since Palamas was, after all, the conscious heir to centuries of monastic interpretation of the *Areopagitica* along exactly these lines. His was not a reinvention of Dionysius, but the articulation of a long tradition out of which Dionysius himself had come. «Correctives», Christological or otherwise, were not part of St. Gregory's agenda. He did not need them. He needed only to understand and read his source correctly, and that is exactly what he did do with wisdom and acumen.

---

[47] *PG* 3. 165A (18:1–4).

[48] Ibid. 165B (18:14–17).

[49] Chrestou, Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ· Συγγράμματα... I. 605–607.

[50] Romanides, Notes... 254–256.

III. Gregory, Dionysius, and Augustine: When East Goes West and West Comes East

A. The *Imago Trinitatis*: Palamas' Appropriation of Augustine

The particular note of the soul as *imago trinitatis* is admittedly not in Dionysius, and, equally, St. Gregory does add something here. I would argue, however, that what he adds is nothing alien in form and intent to the *Corpus Dionysiacum*. The shining forth of the single divine *energeia* of the Holy Trinity from the sanctified soul, and in other places the hallowed creature's reflection of, exactly, the Trinity's saving *pronoia* and *proodoi*[51] (the latter being a term, incidentally, which Ritter takes from Dionysius and not from Palamas' *Chapters* 36–40), are already present in the Areopagite, as is the restored and transfigured image. What St. Gregory adds are certain precisions: the round of love within the *imago*, the soul, as reflecting the movement of love within the Holy Trinity, and the analogy of human being's inner triad of *logos-nous-psyche* with the Three Divine Persons. The first, as Reinhard Flogaus noticed very recently, is more than a little reminiscent of Augustine's *De trinitate*, just as St. Gregory elsewhere in the *Chapters* displays even closer matches — on occasion word for word — with Planudes' translation of the Latin Father's treatise.[52] The second, *logos-nous-psyche*, is not so

[51] It is perhaps unseemly for a writer to quote himself, but the terms πρόοδος and πρόνοια are both applied, frequently, in the Dionysian corpus to angels and to human beings as reflections of the single loving procession of the Trinity. They are «directly the result of the love that moves all sentient beings toward providence with respect to those below, communion with their equals, and attraction toward their superiors. The creature is to become at once the expression and agent of the uncreated procession of God that is "revealed and continuously present... in all the hierarchies"»; Golitzin, *Et introibo ad altare dei*... 103–104. The last cites *Celestial Hierarchy* 9.2, 260B (37:11–13). For the application of these two terms to created (if sanctified) beings, see *Divine Names* 4.15, 713A (161:1–5); 4.2, 696B (144:19–145:1); 4.7, 704B (152:14–18); 4.8, 709D (158:13–18); 4.13, 712A (159:1–3); *Celestial Hierarchy* 8.2, 240C (34:11–14); 15.1, 328C (51:18–21); 15.6, 333D (55:20–22); 13.3, 301D (46:1–5); 15.5, 333B (55:10–11); 15.9, 340A (59, 1); *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* 2.1, 392B (69:6–7) and 3.3.3, 429B (82:17–83:10). The sense of all these texts is the same, and it is exactly what Professor Ritters seems to think appears only in St. Gregory as a «corrective». To the contrary, Dionysius is no different, and is himself picking up and echoing a theme long known in the ascetic literature. Thus for Evagrius (and relevant texts from the latter) on participation in providence and sharing in the work of the angels, see again Golitzin, *Et introibo ad altare dei*... 327–332.

[52] Flogaus, Palamas and Barlaam Revisited... 16–22, singles out in particular Palamas' *Chapters* 36–40 and 122–135, finding especially in the second grouping word for word reflections of Planudes' translation of *De trinitate* — see esp. 18–21, nn. 92–100. The evidence is impressive.

much Augustinian as, I think, a borrowing from St. Symeon the New Theologian's deployment of the identical triad as analogy of the Trinity — which the eleventh-century writer borrowed in his turn from St. Gregory Nazianzus. Symeon's disciple, Nicetas Stethatos, likewise echoes his master's psychological analogy in his own treatises, *Against the Jews* 7–9, and *On the Soul* V.[53] I assume that both SS Symeon and Nicetas must have been available to Palamas, who is certainly aware of and mentions the New Theologian elsewhere in his oeuvre. He certainly knew Nazianzus' work as well, but I choose to mention Symeon and Nicetas here because both of them represent something of an expansion on this theme as it appears in the fourth-century Cappadocian. Palamas seems thus to be carrying on a certain trajectory of thought to which his more proximate predecessors had already contributed.

In choosing to underline *Chapters* 36–40, Ritter does inadvertently put his finger on something that is very interesting: St. Gregory's quietly selective appropriation of the great Father of the West's classic treatise on the central dogma of the Christian faith. As Flogaus has convincingly demonstrated, it is very clear that Palamas quite liked much of what he had read in *De trinitate* and, moreover, found that those sections which he particularly liked, all of them from the latter part of Augustine's work, could be easily and naturally engrafted into already existing elements within Greek Christian literature in such a way as to enrich and deepen the whole. In this regard, St. Gregory was a good deal bolder and more confident of the strength of his tradition than are many modern Orthodox theologians. It is equally clear to me, on the other hand, as it was to Romanides before me, that St. Gregory must have positively rejected the polemics of *De trinitate* I–IV, which sound a great deal like Barlaam on the question of the biblical theophanies, and where Augustine set his face against and broke with prior tradition in order to deny the *visio dei* both to the saints of Israel and to Christians on this side of the eschaton.[54] Palamas did not then accept the whole of Augustine on the

[53] For discussion and references to St. Symeon's use of this triad in his *Ethical Discourses* and *Hymns*, see A. Golitzin, St. Symeon the New Theologian on the Mystical Life: The Ethical Discourses. Vol. III: Life, Times, Theology (Crestwood—New York, 1997) 130–133. For Nicetas Stethatos, see esp. *On the Soul* V, and *Against the Jews* 7–9, in Nicétas Stéthatos: Opuscules et lettres / Ed. J. Darrouzès (1961) (SC, 81) 83–87 and 420–422.

[54] Romanides, Notes… 194–198 and esp. 247–249 and 257–262. Flogaus, Palamas and Barlaam Revisited… 14, n. 70, points to passages from St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom which match Augustine on the Old Testament symbols. I would add, however, the clarification that both the works he cites come from those Fathers' response to Eunomius, and I think in particular to the long-standing (i.e., also pre-Eunomian), *homoian* argument that, as the Son is the object of theophanies of the OT (an axiom of pre-Nicene Christology), this must mean that the Second Person is less

Trinity, but only that (and it seems to have been quite a lot) which he appears to have felt could be enfolded without rupture or strain into the already existent theological *Gestalt* of the Greek East.

B. The Earlier Western Appropriation of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* and the Genesis of the Dionysian «Problem»

I spend some time on this matter because we can find a similar process of assimilation underway 150 to 200 years earlier in the Christian West, but in the latter instance it was the *Corpus Dionysiacum* which was the subject of adoption and change. To be sure, Dionysius was welcomed with vast enthusiasm in the twelfth and thirteenth-century West, and was quickly promoted to an authority second only to the scriptures — as, for example, in the Angelic Doctor's *Summa theologiae*, where the Areopagite is (or at leastseems to be) quoted at nearly every turn. The great schema of the *Summa*, the *exitus-reditus* of God in creation and redemption, is another outstanding monument to a pervasive Dionysian influence which extended in Thomas, and in countless other medieval Latins, into questions bearing on mysticism, hierarchical authority (including papal supremacy), angelology, and even architecture, in addition, of course, to speculative philosophical theology.[55] Professor Ritter and many others are quite right to point out that there is nothing remotely comparable in the East to this nearly ubiquitous Dionysian presence in the

than the Father, and therefore a created being. For response to this argument as determining Augustine's own approach to the OT theophanies, see M. R. Barnes, Exegesis and Polemic in Augustine's *De Trinitate* I // *Augustinian Studies* 30.1 (1999) 43–59; and idem, Purity of Heart and the Vision of God: The Sixth Beatitude in Augustine's Trinitarian Theology (unpublished MS, kindly made available to me by the author). The older, pre-Nicene understanding, however, did not simply disappear. Once the Eunomian furore had died down, it came back in subsequent Eastern Christian literature. The monastic writers seem never to have lost sight of it, though it played an important role in the late fourth-century, early fifth-century debate in ascetical circles over «anthropomorphism». On this debate among Eastern monks, see A. Golitzin, Forma lui Dumnezeu şi Vederea Slavei: Reflecţii asupra Controversei «Antropomorfite» din anul 399 d. Hr. // idem, Mistagogia: Experienţa lui Dumnezeu în Ortodoxie / Tr. Ioan Icâ, Jr. (Sibiu, 1998) 184–267, esp. 232–236. Somewhat *contra* Romanides, we might also recall that the notion of the *visio dei luminis* as available in the present life does not wholly disappear from the Christian West for a very long time. Here see esp. Dom Emmanuel Lanne, L'interprétation palamite de la vision de saint Benoît // Le millénaire de Mont Athos: 963–1963 (Chevtogne—Venezia, 1963) 2, 21–47.

[55] A. Louth synoptically, in The Influence of Denys the Areopagite on Eastern and Western Spirituality in the 14th Century // *Sob/ECR* 4 (1982) 185–200, and P. Rorem in detail according to themes, in Pseudo-Dionysius: A Commentary…, provide useful surveys of this process at work. Rorem is particularly helpful on the Western reception.

medieval West. Where they are wrong is in assuming that this was so because the East had already developed, as it were, antibodies to the Neoplatonist virus which they believe Dionysius to have represented. According to this accounting, the West's immune system was in contrast less well prepared for this foreign body, and suffered a Dionysian epidemic in consequence.[56]

This very widespread picture of Dionysius in West and East is mistaken on a couple of counts. It does, though, explain certain things about major trends in modern scholarship on Dionysius and, perhaps by extension, may shed a modest light on the scholarly treatment of St. Gregory and the Hesychast Controversy. First, the medieval Latin West to which Dionysius came with such *éclat* already had its own distinctive theological *Gestalt*, one which had, moreover, been shaped in fundamental ways (particularly after the Carolingians) by St. Augustine.[57] What then occurs when the Areopagite arrives is less the latter's pervasive influence than precisely the recasting or re-shaping of Dionysius to conform to the already established main lines of Latin theology, spirituality, and ecclesiology. In the process, as scholars such as Andrew Louth and Paul Rorem have pointed out, the unitary quality of Dionysian thought is broken up, fractured in fact, with different pieces of it then incorporated into whatever subject the particular medieval thinker is considering — e.g., the speculative theology of the *Summa*, the mysticism of Eckhart, the architectural plans of Abbot Suger of St. Denys, or the ecclesiology of the papal apologists and canonists.[58] When therefore a theologian who is passionately devoted to the Augustinian inheritance appears on the Western scene at the end of Middle Ages, and when he rightly notices how these glittering shards of the *Areopagitica* have been tacked onto (or in some cases — e.g., Aquinas' — incorporated with magisterial elegance into) the great Bishop of Hippo's thought, he protests against them as foreign elements and labels them — wrongly — *plus platonizans quam christianizans*.[59]

---

[56] This is the view that suffuses especially Rorem's account in Pseudo-Dionysius: A Commentary…

[57] I confess that I have only an impressionistic sense of this development, i.e., the near exclusive dominance of Augustine from, particularly, the Carolingian period in the West.

[58] See again Rorem, Pseudo-Dionysius: A Commentary… 77–81 on possible influences on Gothic architecture, 30–36 on Dionysius' presence in papal apologists, 169–174 on Western systematic theology, and 214–225 on Medieval mysticism.

[59] Perhaps the most famous and influential twentieth century argument for, as it were, the Dionysian presence in Medieval thought as provoking the Reformation is that of Anders Nygren's Agape and Eros / English tr. by P. S. Watson (London, 1953). See esp., in the latter edition, pp. 576–593, where Dionysius appears as the climax of a process of betrayl of the Christian Gospel of redeeming love which Luther's rediscovery of *Galatians* would be called upon to rectify. Florovsky, Byzantine Ascetical and Mystical Writers…, devotes his study precisely to a refutation of Nygren.

Thus with Martin Luther's advent begins the great Western debate about Dionysius, fortified over the past century by Stiglmayr's and Koch's demonstration of his undoubted fondness for late Neoplatonism. Yet, in a sense, the debate in the West both then and now is much less over Dionysius himself than it is over how straight one takes one's Augustine — pure, as in Luther, Calvin, or the Jansenists, or somewhat dilute and modified, as in the great Schoolmen. Put another way, and I confess a little mischievously, perhaps the debate is really over how one takes one's Neoplatonism: in the strictly Augustinian mode, or the latter as tinctured by the Areopagite.[60]

It is, secondly, against this larger and strictly Western debate, which is still in progress, that we are to understand the matter of the «Christological correctives» supposedly added to Dionysius by St. Gregory or, earlier, by St. Maximus or, in the most recent scholarship, earlier still by the *Scholia* of John of Scythopolis.[61] As I hope my close examination of a few selected texts from both SS Gregory and Dionysius has helped to show, these «correctives» are an illusion, and what I should like further to suggest is that this mirage is in fact the projection onto both saints of that same internal, Western debate. It is a kind of shimmer, reflecting off of Western hermeneutical spectacles and onto the pages of the Eastern writers. The fault, I hasten to add, does not therefore lie so much in the individual scholars, such as Professor Ritter, who is obviously a man of great learning and of immense good will, as it does in the lense itself through which they read the materials before them.[62] Now, it is perfectly natural that people should look at things from the perspective, the standpoint, to which they are not only accustomed, but which in this instance often includes the shape of their fundamental commitment to the Christian faith. Where this becomes dangerously misleading, however, is in the assumption that their own perspective holds good across the entire

---

For Florovsky's own analysis of, and difficulties with, Dionysius, see A. Golitzin, «A Contemplative and a Liturgist»: Father Georges Florovsky on the *Corpus Dionysiacum* // *SVTQ* 43.2 (1999) 131–161.

[60] See again Rorem, Pseudo-Dionysius: A Commentary… 169–174, for a negative account of this «tincture». There are, on the other hand, obviously countless positive assessments of the Dionysian addition to Augustine's inheritance among modern advocates of Thomistic philosophy and theology, such as, e.g., W. J. Hankey, Dionysian Hierarchy in Thomas Aquinas: Tradition and Transformation // Denys l'Aréopagite et sa postérité… 405–438.

[61] See thus Rorem, Annotating the Areopagite… Esp. 77–82 for Scythopolis as «Christologically correcting» Dionysius.

[62] I would read Professor Ritter, just as Rorem and — much more obviously — Nygren, as particularly susceptible to the problem of a distinctive hermeneutical lens, given their common background in the Lutheran Reformation. Rorem, indeed, is quite explicit on this score in his recent article, Martin Luther's Christocentric Critique of Pseudo-Dionysian Spirituality // *LuthQ* 11 (1997) 291–307.

field of Christian literature. In the case of Eastern Christianity, it manifestly does not, and to ignore that fact is inevitably to create confusion and false alarms or, at the least, to miss essential elements in the writers under consideration. Given also that patristic scholarship in its modern form is a Western invention, and that it is the West which sets its agenda, it is all too easy for Orthodox scholars taking part in the conversation — as take part in it I believe they must — to be fooled by these non-issues. This is clearly what happened both to my own dear Fr. John Meyendorff and, to a lesser degree, even to Fr. Georges Florovsky, as well as to many of our contemporaries.

My third and last point is, I hope, somewhat more positive. I would like to take this occasion to register the suggestion that we might in future approach of the matter of St. Gregory's debate with Barlaam *et alii* with a slightly different and I hope more fruitful set of questions than have hitherto largely prevailed. We have seen that Palamas as «corrector» of the Areopagite is a sterile point of departure. Questions of Dionysian «influence» or «non-influence» are likewise mostly useless, to the degree at least that they presuppose fundamental differences between St. Dionysius and the rest of the Eastern dogmatic and ascetico-mystical tradition. The fact is that there are none. There do exist, to be sure, different points of emphasis between different sainted authors over the centuries, and Dionysius is no exception to that rule (thus the «ecclesiastical» emphasis I noted above, which has been treated in such amusingly different ways by Eastern bishops and monks), but the fundamental fact is that he is not an anomaly. He is instead part of the same stream which feeds St. Gregory eight hundred years later. This is, to repeat myself, the reason why the matter of his «influence» is so markedly more prominent in the West than in the East. He does not stand out in the latter because, exactly, he is not a foreign body, nor does it ever occur to Palamas to treat him as such. The sooner we get over this occidental obsession with Dionysius as the alien, the sooner we shall be able to ask some genuinely interesting questions.

In the two articles to which I have several times referred over the course of this essay, Fr. John Romanides led the way in asking the kind of questions that I am interested in proposing. He noticed and underlined the fact that Barlaam on occasion sounds very like the first four books of Augustine's *De trinitate*, and that the Calabrian then conformed his reading of Dionysius to something very similar to the Bishop of Hippo's thesis that the Old Testament theophanies were mere angelophanies, or even symbolophanies.[63] Here,

[63] See above, n. 54. I should add that I am not entirely persuaded by Romanides that it was actually Augustine himself from whom the Calabrian was drawing directly. Sinkiewicz' analysis (above nn. 4 and 8) of Barlaam on the knowledge of God seems to account adequately for the latter's rejection of the theophanies as truly divine manifestations.

of course, is also what St. Gregory must have found so profoundly strange about Barlaam's version of the Areopagite. What Romanides did not notice, however, was what Professor Ritter inadvertently signaled and Flogaus pointed out at length, which is that St. Gregory himself, on picking up Planudes' translation sometime after the debate with Barlaam, also found things to like in Augustine on the Trinity, and that he felt free to appropriate them. The points I should like to emphasize are, first, if *both* of these Greek theologians borrowed from the great Western Father; then, second, what they chose to emphasize were *different parts* of the same treatise. If Romanides is right about Barlaam (though I grant that his assertion of Augustine's direct influence is debateable), then the Calabrian was attracted to Augustine's opening polemic against the ancient reading of the theophanies. Palamas, on the other hand, liked and adopted the soul as *imago trinitatis*. To what degree, I wonder, might we then not see some of the Hesychast Controversy and its aftermath as, in certain respects at least, an episode in the assimilation of the great Father of the West to the theological *Gestalt* of the Christian East?

I gather, though I am no expert in this period, that the evidence for Greek-Latin contacts in medieval times, and particularly following the Fourth Crusade, is very considerable and steadily increasing. Granted, the trauma of 1204 was scarcely the best way to introduce two different peoples and theological cultures, but it is undeniable that the Latin presence was thereafter virtually ubiquitous throughout the former imperial territories, and with that presence came cultural contact and exchange. Maximus Planudes' translation of Augustine was a part of that conversation, as were the later translations of Thomas Aquinas by the Kydones brothers. There may then be the possibility of reading the Hesychast Controversy as involved in this exchange, now underway *within* the Orthodox community itself, and dealing — *inter alia* — with the question of how to assimilate Augustine. We would then be confronted with a fascinating analogue to the incorporation of Dionysius within the edifice of Western Christian thought a century and a half earlier. As with Dionysius in the West, the appropriation of Augustine in the East was and remains not without controversy. Here Professor Flogaus in particular has done us a great service. Tracing the lines of the assimilation of Augustine, its bumps and its triumphs, seems to me much more promising and fruitful a project than a great deal of what has been written to date about East-West issues with respect to Dionysius, the Hesychast Controversy, etc. Here, too, I think, we find an issue of more than merely academic interest, for such a project strikes me as opening up paths toward a genuine appreciation of the differences obtaining between the two great Christian cultures. Only when these are properly understood and digested, will we then be able to address seriously and realistically the question and hope of their reconciliation.

ABSTRACT

Citations of the *Corpus Dionysiacum* are exceedingly frequent in the works of Gregory Palamas. Much, indeed, of the latter's *Triads in Defense of the Holy Hesychasts* is devoted to interpretation of the Areopagite, most often in counter argument to the reading of Dionysius insisted on by Palamas' opponent throughout the *Triads*, Barlaam the Calabrian. In his seminal work on St. Gregory, the late Father John Meyendorff was clearly troubled by this Dionysian ubiquity in the Doctor of Hesychasm, particularly since Meyendorff accepted the prevailing scholarly view of Dionysius as, at best, a dubious Christian. In response to this «problem», Meyendorff insisted that Gregory supplied a «Christological corrective» to the Areopagite, i.e., diluted or even eliminated the latter's notion of hierarchy as mediated knowledge in favor of the assertion of Christ's immediate availability to the believer. Palamas thus re-interprets Dionysius, baptizes him, as it were. Throughout his studies, Meyendorff effectively equates the proper reading of the Dionysian corpus with Barlaam's interpretation. This article argues that, to the contrary, Gregory's was a much better reading of the Areopagite than that of either Barlaam or of more modern scholars, and that the key to his insight lies in the ascetical and mystical tradition of the Christian East common to both. Certain key passages from the *Triads* singled out recently by Professor Adolf Ritter as proving Meyenforff's thesis are taken up in the second section of the article. Read closely, and with an eye on both prior Christian ascetical literature and the latter's own roots in the ancient apocalypses, the passages in question, and the Dionsyian texts on which they are based, reveal a common understanding. The article then turns to a brief analysis of Dionysius himself, particularly to his notion of hierarchy and its relation to ascetical tradition as revealed especially in the eighth epistle of the corpus. The «Christological correctives» emerges in sum as a scholarly construct without serious relation to the texts in question.

Hieromonk Alexander (Golitzin)
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

THE BODY OF CHRIST: SAINT SYMEON THE NEW THEOLOGIAN ON SPIRITUAL LIFE AND THE HIERARCHICAL CHURCH

I. Introduction

For many of his critics, both ancient and modern, the relationship between the inner, spiritual life of the believer and the outward structures of the institutional church appears to have been tenuous at best in the writings of St. Symeon the New Theologian. One scholar, for example, who is very well disposed toward him still thinks that St. Symeon «can certainly be criticized in that he stressed the individual and subjective element of Christian life one-sidedly», while seeming «to forget the objective structure of the Church».[1] One key to the problem, and a theme I shall be coming back to in what follows, seems to me to lie in the meaning of the phrase, «objective structure». For now, allow me to state that, while it is true that the great thrust of Symeon's thought lies on the charismatic and — for want of a better word — subjective side of Christian experience, the objectively constituted Church, both as eschatological reality and as historically existing in the institutional forms it received from the Apostles, is never far from his mind and heart, nor do I find any indication in his works that he ever dreamed of contesting it.

In what follows, I shall begin by summarizing St. Symeon on the Church, in particular in its relation to Christ, the Eucharist, and to the individual Christian's appropriation of Christ. Along the way, I intend to pay particular attention to the different, and yet related, notions of the phrase, «the body of

[1] J. van Rossum, Priesthood and Confession in St. Symeon the New Theologian // *SVTQ* 20 (1976) 220–228, here 224. To be fair, van Rossum's opinion is scarcely unique in the scholarship on Symeon. Cf., for example, K. Holl, Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum (Leipzig, 1898) iii, 98, and 102–105; and W. Völker, Praxis und Theoria bei Symeon dem neuen Theologen (Wiesbaden, 1974) 187. For Roman Catholic responses along similar lines, see I. Hausherr, Introduction // Un grand mystique byzantin: Vie de Syméon le nouveau théologien (Rome, 1928) lxxi; J. Darrouzès' «Introduction» to his edition of Symeon's Ethical Discourses: Traités théologiques et éthiques (Paris, 1966) (SC, 122) 28–33; and P. Miguel, La conscience de la grâce selon Syméon le nouveau théologien // *Irénikon* 42.3 (1969) 314–342, esp. 340–342.

Christ». Second, I will turn very briefly to St. Symeon's background in Scripture and Tradition, with an eye particularly to the notion, «objective structure», specifically the belief in a divinely revealed structure of worship, and to the importance which that particular datum of the faith was held to have for the spiritual life from very early on Christian history. Third, I will take up an unusual pairing, Symeon the New Theologian and Dionysius the Areopagite, in order to argue that the latter's idea of «hierarchy» is not in fact so very far away from the former's. Both the eleventh century «mystical anarchist» and the apparent advocate *par excellence* of clerical authority will emerge as speaking out of a common tradition, rooted in the revelation accorded Israel, summed up in Christ, and continuing especially in the literature of the monastic movement.

II. A Summary of St. Symeon on the Church, the Body of Christ, and our Deification

A. The Body of the Risen Jesus: the Flesh of Adam and First-Fruits of the New Creation

For Symeon, the Church is more than an objective structure. It is reality with an upper-case «R». It is *more* real or objective a truth than the phenomenal world, the universe embraced by the five senses and darkened by the Fall. Like the Platonism of late antiquity, he holds that the unseen, intelligible world is the more truly existing one. Unlike the pagan philosophers, however, and together with the Fathers, his view is also firmly rooted in the scriptures. The Resurrection of the Lord Jesus has ushered in a new condition of existence, that new and different mode of being which is «the body of Christ». The Lord's risen body, animated by the Holy Spirit, has become the first-fruits of a new creation: «for in Him dwells the fullness of the divinity bodily» (Col 2:9), and «from this fullness have we all received» (Jn 1:16) — scriptural phrases that Symeon quotes, for example, at the conclusion of the second of his two long discourses on the Church which open the *Ethical Discourses*, and from which I shall be drawing primarily for my summary of his ecclesiology. Again in the second *Discourse*, he traces God's saving economy in terms of the «portion» God took from Adam to fashion Eve. The history of salvation is the story of this «portion»: from Eve through Noah, to the election of Israel in Abraham and the Covenant with Moses on Sinai, to David the King, and finally to the Virgin Mother:

> God took from the Virgin flesh endowed with a mind and soul... Having taken this same from her, He gave it His own Spirit, the Holy Spirit, and enlarged it with what it had not had before: life everlasting... in order for Him to re-create the nature of Adam... so that the children who would be born of God might receive regeneration through the Holy Spirit, and then

> that all who believe in Him might become, in the Spirit, God's own kin and so comprise [with Him] one single body.[2]

Because Christ has become «our kinsman» in the flesh, He has also made «us co-participants in His divinity», and, since the latter «cannot be broken down into parts... all of us [therefore] who partake of it in truth must necessarily be one body with Christ in the one Spirit».[3]

The flesh of Christ establishes His abiding link with humanity. It is Adam's own flesh, taken from him to form the woman, Eve. But, beginning with our Lord's conception in the new Eve, Mary, this same flesh is filled with the glory of the Word: «For Your spotless and divine body flashes wholly with the fire of Your divinity, [with which] it is entwined and mingled ineffably».[4] This is the glorified flesh mingled with divinity which is imparted to the Christian in Baptism and Eucharist through the action of the Spirit. «When we receive the Spirit of our Master and God», Symeon writes,

> we become participants of His divinity and essence, and when we eat of His all-pure flesh — I mean in the [sacrament of] holy communion — we become truly His kin, of one body with Him.[5]

This new condition, he exclaims, is

> [the] beginning of a new portion and a new world... Up to this point all were shadows and types... but this, this is the truth. This is both the renovation and renewal of the whole world... He Who is Son of God does... not beget children in a fleshly way, but He re-fashions us instead spiritually.[6]

At present the mystery of the new world remains largely hidden, but it continues on occasion to manifest itself «even to the present day» in the bodies of the saints, and Symeon points to the incorruption of the latters' relics as proof.[7] In another place, his fifteenth *Hymn*, he is shockingly insistent on

---

[2] *Ethical Discourses* II.7, lines 144–169 of Darrouzès' edition. Note: all my citations of the *Ethical Discourses* will be from Darrouzès two volume edition, SC 122 and 129 (Paris, 1966 and 1967). From St. Symeon's *Hymnes*, I shall be citing the edition of J. Koder, Syméon le nouveau théologien: Hymnes (Paris, 1969, 1971, 1973) (SC, 156, 174, 196); from his *Chapters*, the edition again by Darrouzès of St. Symeon's *Chapitres théologiques, gnostiques, et pratiques* (Paris, 1957) (SC, 51); and from his *Catechetical Discourses*, the edition by B. Krivocheine, Syméon le nouveau théologien: Catéchès (Paris, 1963, 1964, 1965) (SC, 96, 104, 113). In each case, the citation will feature the number and, if relevant, the subsection of the discourse, followed by the line numbering from the relevant SC edition.

[3] *Ethical Discourse* I.6, 80–82.

[4] *Hymns* 2, 7–9.

[5] *Ethical Discourses* I.3, 83–86.

[6] Ibid. II.7, 1–5 and 27–30.

[7] Ibid. I.3, 79–83.

the presence of Christ in his own body, even in those parts of it which are not usually associated with higher things,[8] and repeats in *Hymn* 16 that his own face and members are «bearers of [divine] light», *photophora*.[9] Incorporated into Christ's body in Baptism, feeding on that same body in the Eucharist, the bodies of the saints become themselves light-filled, transfigured. They become, in short, particular expressions of the «body of Christ», the body of God. «They completely possess God, Who has taken on the form of man», as Symeon writes in *Hymn* 15,[10] to which I would add that, as a result of this possession, and in their turn, they may be said to take on «the form of God». The full manifestation of this miraculous formation awaits the general resurrection and world to come, when, as our author puts it in *Ethical Discourse* 1.5, «the whole earthly creation, this visible and perceptible world, will be changed and united with the heavenly».[11]

B. Personal and Ecclesial in Balance and Mutual Reflection

Implied in my summary so far, as it is explicit so often elsewhere in his writings, is St. Symeon's emphasis on the personal encounter with God incarnate, whether in terms of the vision of glory, the conscious perception of the Presence in the sacraments, the conversation of the soul alone with God alone, or, for that matter, in his related and stubborn resistance to the eccelsiastical authorities' demand that he conform to canonical «due process» in his veneration of the elder who had brought him to Christ. This personal emphasis emerges in, or perhaps better, underlies his use of nuptial imagery regarding the Church in *Ethical Discourse* I where, very typically (though with ample backing in the tradition), the «marriage» of Christ and the Church is mirrored in each of the saints. Mary Theotokos is the original and paradigm of this marriage, but, says our saint, «for each one of the faithful and sons of light this same marriage is performed in like and scarcely diverging manner».[12] Chapter ten of the *Discourse* is devoted in particular to the modalities of the marriage. Symeon is first of all careful to underline that the case of the Virgin is unique, «since it was once and for all that the Word of God became flesh [from her]... and was born, bodily... and since it is not possible that He should take flesh a second time».[13] The, as it were, objective conditions of personal communion with the Word are established once and once only, hence Mary Theotokos' altogether irreplaceable and exalted role. Hence, secondly, the objective nature of the Body of Christ, the Church, that Reality which is

[8] *Hymns* 15, esp. 192–204.
[9] Ibid. 16, 33.
[10] Ibid. 15, 225–231.
[11] *Ethical Discourses* I.5, 116–119.
[12] Ibid. I.9, 76–78.
[13] Ibid. I.10, 51–55.

more true and real than the visible world, and which is communicated to the believer in the sacraments, as with Symeon's reference in the following to the Eucharist:

> ...the same undefiled flesh which He accepted from the pure loins of Mary... and with which He was given birth in the body, He gives to us as food. And when we eat of it... each one of us receives within himself the entirety of God made flesh, our Lord Jesus Christ... present in the body bodilessly, mingled with our essence and nature, and deifying us who share His body, who are become flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone.[14]

It is this union which he calls «the second mode of birth»[15] of God the Word, and it occurs «through the divine Spirit... which is ever working in our hearts the mystery of the renewal of human souls».[16] By communicating in the deified flesh of Christ, the saints are elevated «to the ranks of His mother... His brothers... and His kinsmen». Here, he concludes, «is the mystery of the marriages which the Father arranged for His only-begotten Son».[17]

In the New Theologian's account of the mystical marriage there is clearly an interweaving of the ecclesial and the mystical. Rather, indeed, there is a real identity. The Church is truly the «Temple of the King», but so equally is the Christian the «temple of the Holy Spirit» and «tabernacle» of Christ.[18] The Church is the new world re-created in the Word incarnate, the universe of the age to come, but so, as Symeon argues especially in *Discourse* VI, is «each one of us... created by God as a second world, a great world in this small and visible one», and all are commanded to possess «the sun of righteousness shining within us», and «to provide our neighbor with the example of the immaterial day, the new earth and new heaven».[19] This parallelism, or

[14] *Ethical Discourses* I.10, 55–72.

[15] Ibid. 92–94.

[16] Ibid. 111–114.

[17] Ibid. 185–186.

[18] For the Church as the «temple of the King, His city and world», see *Ethical Discourses* I.10, 44–45. For the use of temple language in the New Testament with regard both to the Church and to the individual Christian, see, for example, I Cor 3:16–17; 6:19; II Cor 5:1–5 and 6:16–18; Eph 2:13–22; and I Pet 2:4; Rev 21:21; together with the same in reference to Christ: Lk 1:35 (cf. Ex. 40:34); Jn 1:14 and 2:19–21; and cf. my discussion and the texts cited in section III B below.

[19] *Ethical Discourses* IV, 794–801 and 826–34. The phrase, «great world in the small», as a description of the human being in the image of God doubtless derives from Gregory Nazianzus, *Or.* 38.11 // *PG* 36. 324A. See also the use to which Symeon's disciple, Nicetas Stethatos, puts this phrase in his treatise, *On the Soul* 27 // Nicétas Stéthatos: opuscules et letters / Ed. J. Darrouzès (Paris, 1961) (SC, 81)88; and also his *Contemplation of Paradise* 8.53 (*Opuscules* 176), where the expression is linked to the idea of the Christian as «palace» and «temple» of God. For comment on these and similar expressions in Nicetas, see A. Golitzin, «Earthly Angels and

better, this identity runs throughout his thought. In *Discourse* III, for example, he concludes a meditation on the Eucharist, the sacrament of the Church, by drawing a parallel between the *Cherubikon* of the Byzantine offertory, with its echoes of the temple vision of Isaiah and, especially, of Ezekiel's cherubim throne, on the one hand, and, on the other, the individual Christian as divine throne, carrying the Presence as the seraphim and cherubim of the prophetic theophanies bear aloft the God of Israel.[20] At different points in his *Hymns*, he is awestruck while standing before the throne of the Church's altar when serving as priest «of the divine mysteries»,[21] and trembles before the same mystery revealed in his heart.[22] The Church as God's body in *Ethical Discourses* I.6, is paralleled in *Discourse* VI by the «body of virtues» which is the mature man in Christ, with both passages (especially the second) turning around, interestingly enough, an exegesis of «the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ» of Ephesians 4:13.[23] In *Discourse* I, as we saw, it is the Church which is the world to come while, in *Discourse* X, the Day of the Lord shines in the hearts of the saints even while the latter are still in this present life.[24] Again in *Discourse* X, the two poles of ecclesial and mystical mirror one another and are specifically tied together in the Eucharist:

> His holy flesh is not flesh alone, but flesh and Godhead inseparably yet without confusion: visible in the flesh, i.e., in the bread for physical eyes, while invisible in its divinity for those same eyes, yet seen by the eyes of the soul.[25]

Church and believer, altar and heart, confirm and reflect one another, and both turn around and partake of the one mystery, Christ. Each is, as it were, the icon or sacramental image of the other through which the presence of the Word enfleshed is communicated. Without that deifying and vivifying pow-

---

Heavenly Men»: The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Nicetas Stethatos, and the Tradition of 'Interiorized Apocalyptic in Eastern Christian Ascetical and Mystical Literature // *DOP* 55 (2001) 136–137, and notes 35–37.

[20] *Ethical Discourses* III, 669–698. Cf. above, n.19, for Nicetas, and regarding the very similar use of Ezekiel 1 in an important precursor of Symeon, the author of the *Macarian Homilies*, together with the latter's echoing of currents in Second Temple apocalypses and later Rabbinic mysticism, see A. Golitzin, Temple and Throne of the Divine Glory: Pseudo-Macarius and Purity of Heart // Purity of Heart in Early Monastic and Asectical Literature / Ed. H. Luckman, L. Kulzer (Collegeville, MN, 1999) 107–124, esp. 117 ff., and cf. again my discussion in section III B below.

[21] See, for example, *Hymns* 19, 33–103.

[22] See, e.g., Ibid. 8, 69–73; 13, 32–38; and 16, 18–30.

[23] *Ethical Discourses* IV, 364–620.

[24] Ibid. X, 612–737.

[25] Ibid. 765–769.

er, both are equally idols, mere flesh or naked institution, just as the Eucharist iself is, without the perception of the «eyes of the soul», merely bread, and the Lord Jesus not God, but a failed prophet.[26] It is faith which reveals the wandering preacher from Nazareth as true God in the form of a man, the Eucharist as the bread from heaven, and the Church and believer — the great world and the small, or better, the one, unique great world — as complementary expressions of the Eighth Day and age to come. All of this features in what I take to be St. Symeon's understanding of the biblical phrase, the «body of Christ», with which I chose to preface my assigned title. That body is, first, the actual flesh of the Lord Jesus, transmuted through the Resurrection in the Holy Spirit; into which flesh, second, we are incorporated as the Church, the «Israel of God», which is realized, made present, in the liturgical assembly; where, third, we receive again the same Body of Christ as Eucharist; in order thus, fourth, for each of us to become a particular manifestation of the body of God, or, put another and doubtless more recognizable way, the realization of the divine image and likeness. Regarding my fourth point, we surely also glimpse a basis for St. Symeon's understanding of the spiritual father, the «man of God», who embodies the divine presence — specifically, the presence of Christ — for his disciple. In what remains of this paper, it is especially the relation between the second and fourth of those meanings, the Church, particularly as the liturgical assembly, and the individual believer as the «form of God», or, as I put it above, the coordination between the ecclesial and the mystical, which shall occupy our attention.

III. Some Background to St. Symeon's Language: the «Pattern» of Heaven

A. Microcosm and Macrocosm

Before turning to what I take to be St. Symeon's definitive discussion of this mutual reflection or, indeed, of mutual formation, I should like to offer a brief word on its sources. In part, it is the ancient idea of the microcosm (man) reflecting the macrocosm (universe) which enjoys a long and distinguished history in the Greek philosophers. Plato deploys it in the *Republic* in order to portray the ideal state as the rational man writ large, and it is central to the Stoics, perhaps especially to their ethics, who saw the universe reflect-

[26] See *Ethical Discourses* X, 738–714, and also esp. III, 410–554, for discussion of the Eucharist in terms of perception and non-perception of the presence of Christ's divinity borrowed from, and referring continually to, John 6:32–57, where the Jews of this passage truly see Christ, but do not perceive Him correctly. His divinity is hidden from them. See as well the analysis of this passage in A. Golitzin, St. Symeon the New Theologian on the Mystical Life: the Ethical Discourses. Vol. III: Life, Times, Theology (Crestwood, NY, 1997) 111–116.

ed in the individual.[27] Plotinus fuses Plato and the Stoa in order to produce the doctrine that each person is a *kosmos noētos*, spanning the chasm from matter to the One itself.[28] His successors, the later Neoplatonists, carry on to elaborate a vision of reality that is at once an analysis in detail of the «the great chain of being», and a dissection of the human psyche as reflecting both the structures of the sensory world and the intelligible universe of eternal forms.[29] Certain among these successors, in particular Iamblichus of Chalcis and Proclus Diadochus, add the caveat, against Plotinus' teaching of a potentially immediate access to the divine, that the soul of itself is incapable of making the ascent to divinity, but that it requires the assistance of sacred rites and the gods' gracious condescension in order to bridge the gap between its own world and the heavens.[30] Later Christian writers, notably the anonymous Syrian who wrote under the name of Dionysius Areopagites, would see in this last school of pagan philosophy and its theurgy a point of convergence with long-established, Christian teaching that bore on the relationship between public worship and the personal opening up to God's presence in the soul.[31] It is very unlikely, I think, that St. Symeon had much of any direct exposure to the philosophers, but I think it a certainty that he did know his Dionysius, as well, to be sure, as other Church Fathers who both preceded and succeeded the *Corpus areopagiticum*.[32]

---

[27] On the notion of man as microcosm through early Neoplatonism, see A. Meyer, Wesen und Geschichte der Theorie von Mikro- und Makrocosmos (Bern, 1900) 1–46.

[28] On the Plotinus' fusion of Plato and Stoicism, see A. H. Armstrong, An Introduction to Ancient Philosophy (London, 1963) 175–186.

[29] For the simultaneity of macrocosm and microcosm in later Neoplatonism, see S. Gersh, From Iamblichus to Erieugena: Studies in the Pseudo-Dionysian Tradition (Leiden, 1973) 27–120.

[30] See J. R. Rist, Pseudo-Dionysius, Neoplatonism, and the Weakness of the Soul // From Athens to Chartres: Neoplatonism and Medieval Thought / Ed. H. J. Westra (Leiden—New York, 1992) 135–161; and G. Shaw, Theurgy and the Soul: the Neoplatonism of Iamblichus (Penn State, 1995) Esp. 237 ff.

[31] On Dionysius' use of prior, predominantly Syrian-Christian, ascetical ideas regarding the co-ordination of litugical worship and the «inner man», see my discussion in part 4A below, together with A. Golitzin, *Et introibo ad altare dei*: The Mystagogy of Dionysius Areopagita with Special Reference to its Eastern Christian Predecessors (Θεσσαλονίκη, 1994) (Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων, 59) Esp. 349–392; and, for a summary account of the same, idem, Liturgy and Mysticism: The Experience of God in Eastern Orthodox Christianity // *Pro Ecclesia* 8.2 (1999) 159–186, esp. 173–185.

[32] For argument that St. Symeon did know Dionysius, and appreciate him, see A. Golitzin, Anarchy versus Hierarchy? Dionysius Areopagites, Symeon the New Theologian, Nicetas Stethatos, and Their Common Roots in Ascetical Tradition // *SVTQ* 38.2 (1994) 131–179; and idem, Symeon the New Theologian on the Mystical Life… 156–173, of which last the present essay is at some points a repetition, at others a kind of summation, and at still others an updating.

B. The Temple in Old and New Testaments, and in Early Christian Literature: The Pattern of Heaven and «Place» of the Divine Presence

First, however, let me touch — if very sketchily — on the chain of development which leads to Dionysius, and thence to the New Theologian, and indeed beyond them both to the end of the Byzantine era, and on to the present day. We find its beginnings embedded in the foundational revelation accorded Israel. Following the definitive manifestation of God to Israel on Sinai and the subsequent gift of the covenant, Moses ascends the mountain again at the end of Exodus 24. What follows is arguably the climax of the Sinai theophany, the revelation of the tabernacle. «Have them make Me a sanctuary so that I may dwell among them», God tells Moses, and then adds: «In accordance with all that I show you concerning the pattern of the tabernacle and of its furniture, so you shall make it» (Ex 25:8–9). From long before Christ, this «pattern» revealed to the Lawgiver was assumed to be the heavenly original, God's own temple or palace on high. This is arguably the background of Isaiah's vision in the Jerusalem temple, or of Ezekiel's visionary restoration of city and temple in Ezk 40–48, and it is quite explicit by the time we arrive at the apocalyptic literature of the two centuries immediately before Christ.[33] The tabernacle, and then the Temple at Jerusalem, comprise the locus of God's dwelling among His people, the place of the *Shekinah*, to use the word favored by the rabbis for the divine presence. Even with the Second Temple's destruction in A.D. 70, it is still the temple and its accompanying cultus which in a sense govern the rabbis' reconstruction of Jewish life in the *Mishnah* and *Talmud*. Both popular and esoteric Jewish piety would continue to build on biblical precedents linking the Temple with creation, with visionary experience, and with the age to come.[34]

The idea of the temple is quite as important for Christianity. With an eye both to my assigned topic, and to what we have seen Symeon say so far, I would venture to state that the idea of the temple is nothing less than central

[33] For the worship of the tabernacle and of the Jerusalem temple as linked even in the biblical texts with the worship of heaven, and with the accounts of creation and Eden in the opening of Genesis, see R. J. Clifford, The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament (Cambridge, MA, 1972) Esp. 98–181; M. Weinfeld, Sabbath, Temple, and the Enthronement of the Lord — the Problem of the Sitz im Leben of Genesis 1, 1–2:3 // Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles / Ed. A. Caquot, M. Delcor (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1981) 501–512; J. Levenson, Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible (San Francisco, 1985) Esp. 111–184; and M. Himmelfarb, Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses (Oxford—NY, 1993) Esp. 9–46.

[34] See J. Levenson, The Jerusalem Temple in Devotional and Visionary Experience // Jewish Spirituality I: From the Bible to the Middle Ages / Ed. A. Green (New York, 1988) 32–61; and for latter rabbinic traditions about the Temple, R. Patai, Man and the Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual (New York, 1967^2) Esp. 54–131.

for New Testament christology, ecclesiology, and soteriology. The Lord Jesus replaces tabernacle and temple as the primary «place» of the divine presence. In the Fourth Gospel, He is Himself the Glory or *Shekinah* Who has «tabernacled among us». He is the Immanuel in Matthew, and His conception in Mary Theotokos, as described in Luke 1:35, deliberately echoes the overshadowing of the tabernacle by the divine Glory in the Septuagint wording of Exod 40:34. Again in the Gospel of John — but also implied by the false witnesses' accusations against him in the Synoptic Gospels — it is His body which is specifically identified with the temple building. Likewise, the assembly of the believers, the Church, is also temple, as in Eph. 2:20–22 and I Peter 2:4–9, the place of the Risen One's presence and, with Him, of the heavenly Zion, as in Heb. 12:18–24, where the faithful are invited to partake of the «bread from heaven», the food of the angels. Third, the believer him- or herself is called by the Apostle Paul «temple of God» and «temple of the Holy Spirit», is summoned by the same to transfiguration «from glory to glory», and, in the words of Christ in the Fourth Gospel, is spoken to as having already received the same glory as the Son received from the Father «before the world was». Elsewhere, in John 7:37–39, the reader is invited to become a fount of the living water of the Spirit for others. This image is taken directly from the lore of the Temple as the source of the eschatological river of life, first appearing in Ezk 47:1 ff. and repeated, *inter alia*, in the Revelation's portrait of the heavenly city.[35] I do not think it too much to say that the famous — or infamous — Eastern Christian soteriology of deification draws ultimately on these traditions of tabernacle and temple, and the scriptural *loci* I have cited in support of them are merely a selection.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to trace the continuities of this theme in subsequent Christian literature. Suffice it to say here that the notion of temple, whether in reference in Christ, to the Church, or to the believer, features prominently and arguably even centrally in the patristic witness. It is a key, for example, to the theology of the martyr as we find the latter in the letters of St. Ignatius of Antioch, or in the account of St. Polycarp of Smyrna's martyrdom a couple of generations later.[36] Similarly, the sainted ascetic

[35] For the Old Testament background of the eschatological river flowing from the Temple in both John 7:38–39 and Rev 22, 1, see respectively R. Brown, The Gospel of John (New York, 1966) (Anchor Bible Commentary, 29) Vol. I. 320–324; and J. R. Swete, Revelation (Philadelphia, 1979) 307–311.

[36] Thus see Ignatius, *Romans* 2, 4, and 8 on himself as a «libation», «God's wheat», and hearkening to the «living water», together with the *Letter of the Smyrneans* 14–15 on Polycarp's martyrdom, describing the latter in terms of Eucharist and incense offering. For the Greek text of both, see Ignace d'Antioche: Lettres. Martyre de Polycarpe / Ed. P. Camelot (Paris, 1969) (SC, 10) 108, 110–112, 116, and 226–228. On the theology of the Christian martyr as drawing on the traditions and language of the Temple, see the recent and very important essay by R. D. Young, In Procession be-

as «temple», as site of theophany, appears in a popular mode in the second and third-century, apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, and, in a more philosophically sophisticated vein, in the early Alexandrians, Clement and Origen.[37] The indwelling of the divine glory of Christ in the Spirit, the light of the

fore the World: Martyrdom as Public Liturgy in Early Christianity (Milwaukee, WI, 2001) Esp. 3–37; particularly the following from p. 12: «Martyrdom was a ritual... understood as both a repetition of baptism or substitute for it, and a sacrifice parallel and similar to Christ's passion and the Eucharist, that is to say, as a redemptive sacrifice. *It was the instantiation of the Temple's new presence among Christians, who saw themselves as true Israel and spiritual temples*». The emphasis is mine.

[37] To sample from the Apocryphal Acts in roughly chronological order, see for example Thekla's clothing with fire, i.e., the martyr-ascetic as theophanic, in the *Acta Pauli et Theclae* 34 // Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha / Ed. M. Bonnet (Hildesheim, 1959) II.1, 261:2–4); together with the fragrance of perfumes all around her in 35 (261:6–7), and the twice-repeated epithet awarded her by her persecutors: *hierosylos*, «desecrator of temples», in 28 (255:9) and 32 (258:8). The name is clearly ironic, since in fact Thekla is revealed in chapters 34–35 as, in effect, herself a *true* temple, in opposition to the false temples of the pagans. Second, there are the *Acta Thomae*, chapters 12 (Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha... II.2, 117:1), 94 (207:16–18), and 144 (251:18–19), especially 94, where the ascetics as «holy temples» are even accorded «the authority to forgive sins». In a third example, we find the remarkable description of the body of the ascetic, Mariamne, stripped in preparation for martyrdom, as taking on the likeness of a «glass ark [*kibōtos*], filled up with light» and surrounded «by a cloud of fire», in the fourth-century *Acta Phillipi* 126 (Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha... II.2, 55, 11 and 26), where the description of the ascetic's body is obviously intended to evoke the Ark of the Covenant as the resting place of the divine Glory, such as we find it described in Ex 40:34, or in I K 8, 10–11, together with the «devouring fire» of the Glory descending on Sinai in Ex 24:16–17, and of course the New Testament narratives of Christ's Transfiguration. In each of these, particularly in the first and third, we find the ascetic saint instantiating — to borrow a term from Professor Young above, n. 36 — the «form of God». Recall thus Symeon on his own transformed limbs in *Hymns* 15 and 16, touched on above in section IIA and nn. 8–10. Here is the saint, in short, as conformed to «the body of His [Christ's] glory» (Phil. 3:21). On this theme, the transition in Eastern Christian literature from the outward vision of the divine Glory such as we find the latter described in Second Temple era apocalypses and in later, rabbinic mysticism, to the Christian him- or herself as, in Christ, becoming the «body of the Glory», see A. Orlov, A. Golitzin, «Many Lamps are Lightened from the One»: Paradigms of the Transformational Vision in the Macarian Homilies // *VC* 55 (2001) 281–299, esp. 292 ff.

For Clement of Alexandria's Christian gnostic as «temple», see *Stromateis* V.6 (*GCS* 40, 1) and VII.13 (*GCS* 58, 25–59:5); and for Origen on the Christian saint as God's city, kingdom, and paradise, as place of the «throne» of the Father and Son (and therefore temple), see his *De Oratione* 25.1 and 3 (Koeteschau, Origenes Werke... II. 359–360). Cf. also Origen's description of the Christian virgin serving as priest within the temple of her body in C. Jenkins, Fragments on 1 Corinthians // *JTS* 9 (1907/8) 29, cited by P. Brown, The Body and Society (New York—Oxford, 1988) 175.

world to come, are reflected in the faces and bodies of the saints, from the martyrdom of Stephen in Acts 6:15 to the purported account of Motovilov's conversation with Seraphim Sarovsky, and on to the present day.

When we come to the fourth century and the remarkable prominence of the ascetic holy man, we also find that ascetic circles in both Roman and Sassanid Mesopotamia are making a concerted and deliberate effort to clarify and coordinate these different senses of temple. Ephrem Syrus features this coordination, especially in his remarkable *Hymns on Paradise*, as do, in an atmosphere charged with a certain background of conflict and tension, the Syriac *Liber Graduum* and the anonymous, Greek collection of homilies attributed traditionally to Macarius the Great.[38] All three, the latter two quite emphatically in a couple of places each, insist on the worship of the Church, the liturgical assembly, as the necessary «pattern» — *hypodeigma* in «Macarius'» words — for «what is at work in the soul by grace».[39] This is no more than a kind of restatement, as it were, of the «pattern» revealed to Moses on Sinai, though now, in the new dispensation, as the *Liber Graduum* expressly insists, this «pattern» includes a threefold association and mutual reflection: of the exalted Lord and the heavenly liturgy, of the visible Church, and of the soul.

IV. Dionysius and Symeon: «Our Hierarchy», Heaven, and the Soul

A. The Dionysian Hierarchy

These Syrian writers comprise the relatively immediate, Christian background of the mysterious author who wrote under the pseudonym of Dionysi-

---

With reference to St. Symeon, it is perhaps of note that the New Theologian appears to have had some familiarity with the apocryphal acts, at least according to B. Krivocheine, *Ho anhyperephanos theos*: St. Symeon the New Theologian and Early Christian Popular Piety // *SP* 2 (1957) 485–494.

[38] See the «Introduction» by S. Brock to his translation of Ephrem, St.Ephrem the Syrian: Hymns on Paradise (Crestwood, NY, 1990), esp. the chart Brock supplies on p. 54 setting out the parallels Ephrem assumes between the Paradise Mountain, Sinai, the Temple, the Christian assembly at worship, and the individual Christian. For the *Liber Graduum*, see M. Kmosko's edition in *PS* III, esp. *Mimra* 12, columns 284–304; English translation in S. Brock, The Syriac Fathers on Prayer and the Spiritual Life (Kalamazoo, MI, 1987) 45–53; and for Macarius, see Homily 52 in H. Berthold's edition of Collection I, Makarios/Symeon. Reden und Briefe: Die Sammlung I des Vaticanus Graecus 694 (B) (Berlin, 1964) Vol. II. 138–142. For comment on the coordination the latter two in particular seek to establish between the worshipping assembly and the individual believer, see R. Murray, Symbols of Church and Kingdom: A Study in Early Syriac Tradition (Cambridge, 1975) Esp. 262–276; and again Golitzin, *Et introibo*... 368–390.

[39] Macarius, Homily 52, Berthold II, 140, lines 7–8.

us Areopagites, and who was also the apparent inventor of one of the keywords in my assigned title, «hierarchy». Far from comprising a straightforward advocacy of what we might call today the ecclesiastical «chain of command», or even, in modern Roman Catholic terms, the *magisterium*, Dionysius' notion of hierarchy includes at once our true world, the foretaste of the world to come, the reflection of the heavenly liturgy, the milieu of our encounter with Christ (or indeed — as I shall have occasion to note below — the body of Christ), and the shaping image or icon of the redeemed human being.[40] Allow me to elaborate just a little on these points through the citation and brief discussion of three texts from his treatise, *The Celestial Hierarchy*. We find his definition of hierarchy in *Celestial Hierarchy* 3.1:

> Hierarchy is, in my opinion, a sacred order, knowledge, and activity which, so far as possible, is in process of being likened to the form of God, [and] which leads up in due proportion to illuminations given it by God for [the purpose of] the imitation of God.[41]

There are a couple of things I should like to note here. The first is the notion of process. Hierarchy, for the inventor of the word, is not a finished thing, not static, but a movement, a becoming. Second, this movement has as its goal «the form of God», *to theoeides*, which answers in Dionysian vocabulary to the biblical phrase, «the image of God», just as «the imitation of God», *to theomimēton*, answers to the divine «likeness». The two terms, in short, are intended to recall the *eikōn* and *homoiōsis* of Genesis 1:26.[42] As a whole or collective entity, hierarchy is thus the process of conformity to the image and likeness.

In the following paragraph, Dionysius moves to the divinely-intended effect of a hierarchy on each of its members:

> The purpose [*skopos*] thus of a hierarchy is the likening to, and union with God, [the] shaping... [and] perfecting of its members [lit., «celebrants»] as divine images [lit., «statues», *agalmata*], as most transparent and unspotted mirrors, recipients of the primordial light and divine ray who, once filled in sacred manner with the radiance imparted [to them], reflect it in turn and without envy to those who come after... [in order thus for each] to become, as the scriptures say, «a co-worker with God» [*theou synergon genesthai*], and to show the divine activity shining forth in himself so far

[40] For hierarchy as the Dionysian world, see R. Roques, L'univers dionysien (Paris, 1954) 36–134; and in relation to both the larger universe and the soul, Golitzin, *Et introibo...* 119–140 and 182–229, respectively.

[41] *Celestial Hierarchy* 3.1 // *PG* 3. 164D; critical text in G. Heil, A. Ritter, Corpus Dionysiacum (Berlin—New York, 1991) 17, lines 3–5. In subsequent citations from Dionysius, I shall be including the Migne column number and, in parenthesis, reference to the page and line numbers of the critical edition.

[42] For texts and discussion, see Golitzin, *Et introibo...* 110–111.

> as possible [*deixai tçn theian energeian en heautôi kata to dynaton anaphainomençn*].[43]

Here I would like to underline five points. First, there is the formative effect of a hierarchy on its members. It «shapes» or «impresses» (*apotypoō*) and «perfects» them. Second, that shaping is itself related to the notion of the image. If hierarchy as a whole, as a collective, is a movement toward conformity with the «form of God», then its purpose is likewise to «impress» on each of its members the divine image, to make them all and each the perfected reflection of God's form and activity. Third, we note throughout this passage the language of light with which the divine form is obviously connected and, even, identified. This is the «primordial light», *archiphōs*, and «thearchic ray», *thearchikē aktis*, which is to shine in the transformed members of a hierarchy, and thence, from them, to others. Hierarchy is in the form of God as light, and is itself a communication of light, a leaping of light from one light-filled being to another, a cascade of light.

My fourth point concerns the identity of this light and ray. From the very beginnings of his labors, which is to say from the first chapters and lines of the *Celestial Hierarchy,* which has been reckoned from antiquity — and I think rightly — to be the first in his sequence of treatises, Dionysius identifies the light which comes to us from «the Father of lights» with the Second Person of the Trinity, the «radiance of the Father», Christ.[44] It is Jesus, he tells us at a number of points, who is the origin (*archē*) and being (*ousia*) of both the angels' hierarchy and of our own.[45] That light which comes leaping down the serried ranks, the «form of God» to which a hierarchy's members are conformed, which they and their hierarchy are called individually and collectively to embody, is Christ. Put another way, that which Dionysius is seeking to express in his to us rather odd and difficult vocabulary, is the scriptural understanding of the Church as «the body of Christ».

This brings me to my fifth point: whether Dionysius has in mind the so-to-speak Church of the angels, the «heavenly hierarchy», or the Church on earth, which he calls «our hierarchy», he always means worship, the liturgy. In *Celestial Hierarchy* I.3, arguably the most important passage in his entire corpus in as much as it supplies the great frame for what is to follow, he explains how Christ provides us with «access» (*prosagōgē*) to the Father and fellowship with the heavenly liturgy of the angels:

> It would not be possible for the human intellect to be ordered with that immaterial imitation of the heavenly minds unless it were to use the material guide that is proper to it, reckoning the visible beauties as reflections

[43] *Celestial Hierarchy* 3.2, 165AB (17:10–18:16).

[44] Ibid. 1.1–2, 120B–121A (7:3–11).

[45] See, e.g., *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* 1.1, 372A (64:1–2), for Jesus as the «origin [*archē*], being [*ousia*] and most divine power [*dynamis*] of every hierarchy».

> of the invisible splendor, the perceptible fragrances as impressions of the intelligible distributions, the material lights an image of the immaterial gift of light, the sacred and extensive teachings [of the scriptures] [as an image] of the intellect's intelligible fulfillment, the exterior ranks [of clergy and laity] [as an image] of the harmonious and ordered state [*hexis*] [of the intellect] which is set in order for divine things, and [our partaking] of the most divine Eucharist [an image] of participation in Jesus.[46]

The physical elements of the Church's worship — here the beauty of the sanctuary, candles, lamps, incense, scripture readings, etc. — all convey spiritual reality. The very ordering of clergy and laity in, presumably, the sanctuary and nave comprises a suggestion of the well-ordered, that is, virtuous soul. All is icon or symbol of a pervasive, unseen reality, the joining of heaven, earth and the soul, which is summed up at the end of the passage with the references to the Eucharist and to Christ.

Does the conjunction of Eucharist and «symbol» mean that Dionysius holds a doctrine of the eucharistic presence which reads the latter as less than «real»? The point has been debated by others, and one recent book has sharply contrasted Dionysius' language of symbol with St. Symeon's sacramental realism, but I am less convinced that the latter is so very different from the Areopagite.[47] To be sure, Symeon never calls the Eucharist a «symbol», but this is only to say that he is obedient to one of the results of the Iconoclast controversy, over two and half centuries after Dionysius, which was to forbid the application of the words «symbol» or «icon» to the consecrated gifts.[48] In substance, however, the two appear to me to be very similar. The bread for both is only «bread» unless its unseen reality is perceived, just as divinity is concealed in the Virgin's son. Likewise, in the coordination between the liturgy in heaven, on earth, and in the soul, Dionysius follows the lead at once of the late Neoplatonists, in that the human microcosm finds access to God only through the forms of traditional worship, and of those Syrian ascetics a century before him who had insisted on the necessary linkage between what

[46] *Celestial Hierarchy* 1.3, 121C–124A (8:19–9:6).

[47] See P. E. Rorem, Biblical and Liturgical Symbols within the Pseudo-Dionysian Synthesis (Toronto, 1984) 76–77, against sacramental realism in Dionysius and, responding to Rorem in defense of a «real presence» in the Dionysian Eucharist, A. Louth, Pagan Theurgy and Christian Sacramentalism in Denys the Areopagite // *JTS* ns 87 (1986) 432–438, and Golitzin, *Et introibo*... 199–202. For Symeon's «realism» in particular as standing in sharp contrast to Dionysius, see H. Alfeyev, St. Symeon the New Theologian and Orthodox Tradition (Oxford, 2000) 95.

[48] On the clear distinction between icon (and symbol), on the one hand, and the Eucharist, on the other, drawn by the later icondules, see J. Meyendorff, Byzantine Theology (Oxford, 1975) 203–204. Prior to the Iconoclast Controversy, however, «symbol» appears relatively often with reference to the Eucharist. For examples, see G. W. H. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford, 1972) 1282.

one of them, the author of the *Liber Graduum*, called the «three churches». Half a millenium later, St. Symeon is part of the same trajectory.

B. Echoes of Dionysius in St. Symeon's Fourteenth Ethical Discourse

That he was a conscious part of this continuum, and moreover that he knew and admired the very passage from the *Celestial Hierarchy* which I just quoted at length, is clear from what I take to be his most important discussion of my assigned topic, his fourteenth *Ethical Discourse*, «On the Feasts and their Celebration». The setting he appears to have in mind is the solemn, liturgical celebration of one of the decisive moments in the history of salvation — the Nativity, the Ascension, or the Descent of the Spirit at Pentecost, etc. — or else, perhaps, the commemoration in vigil and liturgy of one of the great saints, or indeed his own instituted veneration of Symeon the Pious. His overall purpose is to remind his readers of the intent and meaning of liturgical worship. That purpose is nothing earthly. He begins by questioning ecclesiastical solemnities. «How», he asks, can the man who has «seen the Master» and who knows himself as «naked and poor»

> ...take pride in beauty, or exalt himself... or pay great attention to the multitude of candles and lamps, or fragrances and perfumes, or an assembly of people, or a rich... table, or boast in the... presence of men who are glorious upon the earth?[49]

These things are all earthly, «here today», he says, «and tomorrow gone». The one who is wise therefore looks to what is not visible, «the future [i.e., eschatological] events which are present in the rites being celebrated», and, doing so, such a person will celebrate the feast «in the Holy Spirit... with those who celebrate... in heaven».[50] No reckoning of feasts or splendor in decoration suffices if one does not realize that the latter do not comprise «the true feast, but are rather symbols of the feast». Without that realization, he concludes, there is neither «gain nor joy».[51]

St. Symeon certainly does not discourage liturgical solemnities: «God forbid!», he exclaims, and goes on to insist, «On the contrary, I indeed both advise and encourage you to do these things, and to do so lavishly!» He does, though, want to point how to celebrate properly, and to explain what the things done «in types and symbols really mean».[52] In the course of this explanation, he displays his debt to the Areopagite. The function, he says, of the lamps in the church is «to show you the intelligible gift of light» (recall Dionysius' «immaterial gift of light»), and of the fragrances or incense used to reveal «the intelligible myrrh», the anointing of the Spirit which «wells up

[49] *Ethical Discourses* XIV, 26–35.
[50] Ibid. 35–44.
[51] Ibid. 54–78.
[52] Ibid. 87–89.

from within», and «rises like sweet-smelling smoke»[53] (so Dionyius' «spiritual distributions»). In Symeon's further remarks here on the mingled perfumes and incense as reflecting the graced human being, «composed and combined», he says, «with the spiritual perfume... the gifts... of the Holy Spirit», we might call to mind Dionysius description of the *myron* in *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* IV, where the perfumed oil signals Jesus, «the superessential fragrance», Who pervades our being by virtue of the Incarnation.[54]

Stressing that our celebrations here-below are only «a type and shadow and symbol» of the heavenly feast, to which latter we can neither add nor subtract,[55] Symeon shows nonetheless how we may participate in the celestial liturgy. As we briefly noted above in reference to the fourth-century Syrians, and at length with reference to Dionysius on hierarchy, the New Theologian holds that each Christian is called to reflect the worship of heaven. Again, for him as for the others we discussed, the Church at worship is an icon at once of heaven and of the new man transfigured in Christ. His series of comparisons follows the sequence quoted above from *Celestial Hierarchy* I.3 fairly closely, and, like the latter, concludes with the Eucharist. The lamps signify «that light by which the whole world of the virtues is complete», the perfumes and incense «the intelligible perfume of the Holy Spirit», the crowds of laity «the ranks of the holy angels», friends and dignitaries «all the saints», and the groaning board of refreshments «the living bread alone — not that which is perceptible and visible, but He Who comes to you in and through what is perceptible», and the wine «not... this visible wine, but that which appears as wine, yet is perceived by the intellect as the blood of God, light inexpressible».[56] The order is a little different from Dionysius, whose lights precede the perfumes, while Symeon's crowds and dignaries representing angels and saints do not quite match up to the orders of clergy signifying the inner order of the virtuous soul, but the New Theologian overall does seem clearly to be echoing the Areopagite. The thinking behind both is surely very close as well: the Church's liturgy connects us with the angels and with Christ

[53] *Ethical Discourses* XIV, 93–121.

[54] Thus compare *Ethical Discourses* XIV, 121–139, with Dionysius' *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* 4.3.4, 477C–480A (98:23–99:14) on the *myron* as symbol of the incarnate Christ. Relatedly, see also 4.3.1, 476A (96:23–97:1), where Dionysius declares that holy people themselves «are divine images [*agalmata*] of the most divine fragrance», and recall the use of *agalma* above in *Celestial Hierarchy* 3.2, together with my fourth sense of the phrase, «body of Christ», and its meaning for Symeon discussed in II B above, and as reflecting the traditions of temple and vision touched on in III B above, together with nn. 36 and 37. Here we might recall the prominence Dionysius assigns the Transfiguration as foretaste of the eschatological transformation in *Divine Names* I.4, cited below, section IV B, and n. 60.

[55] *Ethical Discourses* XIV, 176–178.

[56] Ibid. 144–223.

while, at the same time, it reflects the soul in union with God. Recalling my remarks above on the «form» of «our hierarchy», in Dionysius' terms, it is also clear that the liturgy for Symeon, too, is more than simply a reflection. It enables union with God, accomplishes it. Properly understood, it shapes the soul. That proper understanding comes through «perception and knowledge», says Symeon, by means of the «intelligible eye of the soul».[57] Likewise, for Dionysius in *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* III and elsewhere, the spiritual senses are given through the sacraments. It is Baptism, he tells us, which formed him, and allowed him to discern rightly, just as the Eucharist is the «sacrament of sacraments», the gathering up — *synaxis* — of the collective and the individual into Christ.[58] Similarly, Symeon remarks at the end of his discourse that, if one allows oneself so to be formed, and thus celebrates the feast and partakes worthily

> of the divine mysteries, all your life will be to you one single feast. And not a feast, but the beginning of a feast and a single Passover [lit., *pascha*]: the passage and emigration from what is seen to what is sensed by the intellect, to that place where every shadow and type, and all the present symbols, come to an end... rejoicing eternally in the most pure sacrifice, in God the Father and the co-essential Spirit, always seeing Christ and being seen by Him, ever being with Christ... than Whom nothing is greater in the Kingdom of God... Amen.[59]

I cannot resist adding that the New Theologian here recalls Dionysius on at least a couple of other occasions. The first occurs in *Divine Names* I.4, where the sequence «now... then... now» punctuates a discussion of the relationship obtaining between the life of the Christian in this world and in the eschaton, a sequence that notes the contrast while affirming an essential communion between the two moments that is mediated by the liturgy, and the Areopagite goes on to assert that, even in the present life, one may be caught

[57] *Ethical Discourses* XIV, 223–247; and cf. Dionysius' deployment of *hyp'opsin* in *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* 3.3.10, 440B (90:10); 12, 444A (92:17–18); 13, 444C (93:14–16); and his use of «recognize», *epigignoskō* (in participial form, «recognizing), in 3.3.15, 445B (94:12–13), together with my argument for these passages as signifying a «real presence», in Golitzin, *Et introibo*... 199–202. See also my remarks on Symeon relative to «recognition» of the Presence above in section II B and notes 26, and 47–48, and below, n. 58.

[58] For Baptism as allowing the author to see (spiritually), see *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* 3.1, 425AB (80:1–4); for the formation of the organs of spiritual perception within the womb of the Church, see Ibid. 2.2.3, 400AB (74:15–75:9) and 3.3.6, 432D (85:11–21); and for the deployment of *synaxis*/*synago* as signifying both individual and collective «gathering» and reconciliation, see Ibid. 3.1, 424CD (97:9–12) and 3.3.8, 437A (88:13–18), respectively. On the Macarian Homilist's similar use of *synago* and like terms derived from, or referring to the liturgy, see Golitzin, *Et introibo*... 380–385.

[59] *Ethical Discourses* 14:280–293.

up into the reality of the world to come.[60] The second occasion is a passage in *Epistle* 9, seldom if ever noted in Dionysian scholarship, on the eschatological banquet of the saints, where, Dionysius says,

> It is Jesus Himself Who gladdens them and leads them to the table, Who serves them, Who grants them everlasting rest, Who bestows and pours out on the them the fullness of beauty.[61]

Over a century before Dionysius, and long before Symeon, the *Liber Graduum* put the relationship perhaps most clearly of all. Christ gave us the visible order of the Church, writes the unknown author, so that

> by starting from these visible things [i.e., the visible liturgy], and provided our bodies become temples and our hearts altars, we might find ourselves in their heavenly counterparts... *migrating there and entering in while we are still in this visible church...*[62]

Note here the «migration», so like Symeon's «emigration» just above, and intimately related, I think, to the famous Dionysian «ecstasy», together with the emphasis all three writers place on this «passage» as both eschatological hope and — if only momentarily — present possibility.

V. Concluding Remarks: Tensions within a Shared Continuum

St. Symeon claimed throughout his active life that he was doing no more that re-affirming the Tradition, «the teachings of the Master and the Apostles that some have perverted».[63] With regard to the theme I was assigned for this conference, the relationship between the spiritual life and the hierarchical church, I think that his claim is just. On the theme of hierarchy, he is occasionally contrasted by modern scholars with that other writer who featured prominently in this paper, Dionysius Areopagites, though the same scholars are then very puzzled when obliged to confront the extraordinarily prominent Dionysian presence in Symeon's passionately devoted disciple, biographer, editor, and all-round champion, Nicetas Stethatos.[64] To be sure, we must allow that Nicetas was a thinker in his own right, but I believe — and hope that

---

[60] *Divine Names* 1.4, 592BC (criticial text by B. R. Suchla, Corpus Dionysiacum I: De Divinibus Nominibus (Berlin, 1990) 114:7–115:5); and, for comment on this passage, A. Golitzin, On the Other Hand // *SVTQ* 34.4 (1990) 305–323, esp. 310–316.

[61] *Epistle* 9.5, 1113A (Heil, Ritter, 206:5–7).

[62] *Mimro* 12.2; *PS* III 288:20–289:8. ET: Brock, 46–47 (emphasis added).

[63] *Catechetical Discourses* 34:248–263.

[64] See most recently Alfeyev, Symeon the New Theologian… 275, n. 9. For Nicetas as, to the contrary, carrying on Symeon's thought in most key respects, including an appreciation for the Areopagite, see Golitzin,«Anarchy versus Hierarchy…; and idem, «Earthly Angels and Heavenly Men»…

I have shown, at least to some extent — that the gap between the «mystical anarchist», Symeon, and Dionysius, «the unilateral theoretician of hierarchy», is more apparent than real.[65] For both the New Theologian and the inventor of the word, «hierarchy», the latter is first and foremost the revealed form of worship, whose literary history begins in the Torah of Israel and culminates in the Church's Gospel. To that revealed form, or «pattern», to borrow from the language of Exodus 25:9, both writers are utterly loyal. They both understand it, moreover, as itself revelatory and formative, and thus of immediate and inescapable relevance to the inner, spiritual life. The «pattern» of heaven is manifested in it, and so also is the form of the soul transformed. It is, for both, the Incarnate Word's communication of Himself. It is the expression of, and participation in, His risen body, the reality of the world to come. Both writers are also in this regard faithful witnesses to prior Tradition, in particular to the ascetical literature of the fourth century and even well before.

The one area where we do find a significant difference between Symeon and Dionysius lies in the latter's persistent — if not perfectly consistent — effort to assimilate the figure of the ascetical holy man to that of the bishop. The spiritual father, the *geron* of early and later monastic literature, is — most of the time — identified with the «hierarch».[66] Symeon, of course, betrays no such ambivalence, nor, to the best of my knowledge, do any of his monastic predecessors and successors. St. Maximus the Confessor's *Mystagogy* simply ignores this attempted Dionysian equivalence, as do such later monastic admirers of Dionysius as Nicetas, Gregory Palamas, and Nicholas Cabasilas. The monks charitably and — so far as I can tell — uniformly ignore the Areopagite's obvious sin against truth here. In contrast, and beginning with Dionysius' earliest known commentator, the bishop John of Scythopolis, Eastern bishops have tended universally to applaud it, while simultaneously ignoring (as does John of Scythopolis himself) the inner reading of «hierarch» and «hierarchy», which is to say, the application — also fully intended by Dionysius — of these terms to the life of the soul.[67] This bifurcated reception of the *Corpus dionysiacum* in the East is an amusing if little-noted fact, just one

[65] I am quoting J. Koder, in the latter's Introduction // Syméon le nouveau théologien: Hymnes… 60–61, n. 2.

[66] See, for example, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* 1.3, 373C (66:4–6), on the hierarch as an «inspired and divine man». On the other hand, there is no stated equation with the bishop in Dionysius' description of the «divine man» and «temple of the Holy Spirit» who acts as «physician» of others in 3.3.7, 433C (86:7–16), nor in his use of the imagery of spiritual fatherhood and sonship as illustrative of the Trinity in *Divine Names* 2.8, 645C (Suchla, 132:5–13).

[67] On Scythopolis' increased emphasis on the bishop's role, see P. E. Rorem, J. Lamoreaux, John of Scythopolis and the Dionysian Corpus: Annotating the Areopagite (Oxford—New York, 1998) 62–64. For later examples of the tensions between «episcopal» and «monastic readings» of Dionysius, see Golitzin, *Et introibo*... 401–413.

more instance, if the reader will, of that long-standing tension between charismatic and intstitutional authority which I, following many others before me, read as an inescapable fact of the Church's life *in statu via*.[68]

I therefore have to admit that I have not completely solved the dichotomy implied in my assigned title, but then I believe that no one has, or can — at least, on this side of the eschaton. «Hierarchy» understood simply as «authority», the «chain of command», as I put it earlier, is indeed largely foreign to St. Symeon. But, if understood as «Church», as «liturgy», and if it includes the notion of the latter as essential, revealed, and a force which shapes the soul, then «hierarchy» has the New Theologian's definite seal of approval. It is in his blood and breath, part of the very fabric of that new reality in Christ to which his entire life was given in witness, and which he understood as summed up in the person of the transfigured saint.

Of course, it was precisely his emphasis on the charismatically endowed elder which led to the New Theologian's conflict with Stephen of Nicomedia and the patriarchal chancery, which is to say, with hierarchy in the modern, impoverished sense. Yet, in at least one passage, we find him speaking of the succession of holy elders in terms which recall, almost verbatim, Dionysius on hierarchy as a cascade of light:

> The intelligible orders of the higher powers are illumined by God from the first order to the second, and from there to all the others in the same way, until the divine light passes through them all. The saints, too, are illumined in the same way by the divine angels, and, as they are bound up and joined together in the bond of the Spirit, they become their [the angels'] equals in honor and emulate them. These saints themselves come after the saints who preceded them, and from generation to generation they join [their predecessors] through the practice of God's commandments. Like them, they are enlightened and receive this grace of God by participation. They become just like a golden chain, with each of them a link, bound to all the preceding saints in faith, love, and good works... one single chain in one God...[69]

A few years ago Bishop Kallistos Ware cited these lines in order to illustrate the idea of a second kind of «apostolic succession», one which exists

[68] Murray makes much the same point about the *Liber Graduum* and *Macarian Homilies* in his Symbols of Church and Kingdom… 275–276. See also on this tension in ecclesial life, J. Meyendorff's essays, «The Holy Spirit as God», and «St. Basil, the Church, and Charismatic Leadership», in idem, The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church (Crestwood, NY, 1982) 162–163 and 204–215, respectively.

[69] *Chapters* 3.4, 5–19. Compare St. Symeon's language here, especially his opening sentence, with Dionysius in *Celestial Hierarchy* 8.2, 240D (Heil, Ritter, 34:14–16), on the «hierarchic law» of transmission from «firsts» through «seconds», and esp. with 13.3, 301A (44:20–24), on the passage of the divine «gift of light», *photodosia*, through the «firsts» to those below. Cf. also the passage from Palladius cited in n. 71 below.

alongside the «visible succession» of the bishops, and which consists of the «spiritual fathers and mothers in each generation of the Church».[70] The bishop's point is a very important one. In its acknowledgement of two successions, it directs us back at once to the broader sense of hierarchy which I have been trying to sketch, and to that tension which exists within it, of which tension we might further admit that SS. Symeon and Dionysius represent different poles. Still, and by way of a last word, I should like to underline a couple of points which I think do much to soften this apparent polarity. First, there is the commonality of expression which I think the New Theologian consciously shares with Dionysius. He at least, if not his students over the past century, understands that both he and the Areopagite are witnesses to, and in fact speaking out of, a common liturgical *and* ascetico-mystical tradition. Allow me to add just one more, little historical datum in support of this assertion. It is a fact that the description of a chain of divinely-inspired teaching, and therefore of successively graced individuals, in terms moreover which recall quite precisely both Dionysius a century later and Symeon much later still, shows up full-blown in Palladius of Heliopolis' letter to Lausus the chamberlain, prefacing the former's *Lausiac History*.[71] The latter work comprises, of course, a signally important testimony to the elders of early monasticism, and was written by no less than a disciple of arguably the most important theoretician of the spiritual life in the long tradition of the East, Evagrius Ponticus. Second, we have seen that this chain of saints, the succession of so-to-speak realized images of God in Christ, is not possible for St. Symeon without the other three senses of the phrase, «body of Christ»; and therefore that he requires, and assumes as a matter of course, the full and original sense of «hierarchy» as I have sought to outline the latter here.

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the analysis of Simeon the New Theologian's thoughts on the Church which was profoundly influenced by the ideas of Dionysius the Areopagite. The study concludes with a discussion of Symeon's fourteenth *Ethical Discourse* where the impress of Dionysius' treatises on the hierarchies is perhaps at its clearest.

[70] Kallistos Ware, «Forward» to Irenée Hausherr, Spiritual Direction in the Early Christian East / Tr. A. Gythiel (Kalamazoo, 1990) vii.

[71] «For the God of all alone is untaught... all others are taught, since they are made and created. The first order of beings have their learning from the most high Trinity; the second learns from the first, the third from the second. Those who are higher in knowledge teach the lower. Palladius of Heliopolis, *The Lausiac History* / Ed. C. Butler (Cambridge, 1903) Vol. II. 7. I am quoting the English translation by R. T. Meyer, The Lausiac History (New York, 1964) (Ancient Christian Writers, 34) 21.

Hieromonk Alexander (Golitzin)
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

DIONYSIUS AREOPAGITES: A CHRISTIAN MYSTICISM?

I. Introduction: A Controversial Figure

The mysterious author who wrote under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite sometime around the turn of the sixth century has been the subject of theological and scholarly controversy for half a millenium.[1] With a few recent exceptions, this controversy has been limited to the Christian West. It began properly with Martin Luther's explicit dismissal of «Dionysius» (whom henceforth I shall refer to without the inverted commas) as *plus platonizans quam christianizans*, «more a Platonist than a Christian», and his warning to «stay away from that Dionysius, whoever he was!» I am myself expert in neither the Reformation generally nor Luther in particular, but I think it not inaccurate to say that he read Dionysius as perhaps the advocate *par excellence* of a *theologia gloriae*, which is to say, a theological perspective which effectively makes superfluous the Incarnation and atoning death of God the Word, and which does so because it assumes that the human mind of itself is capable, at least in potential, of achieving direct contact with the deity. The great doctor of the Reform saw this pernicious attitude, so in opposition to his own *theologia crucis*, as especially embodied in the little Dionysian treatise, *The Mystical Theology*, which he read as an example less of truly Christian piety than of an appeal to the autonomous human intellect, hence: «Shun like the plague that *Mystical Theology* and other such works!» Ever since Luther, though here I should add that I am over-simplifying somewhat, Dionysius has been by and large a «non-starter» for Protestant theology and devotion, while Protestant scholarship, in so far as it deals with him at all, remains generally — or even emphatically — unsympathetic.[2]

---

[1] I will be referring to the Greek text of Dionysius in two editions, *PG* 3, with the column numbers, and, in parenthesis, the page and line numbers of the recent critical edition: Corpus Dionysiacum. Vol. I: De divinibus nominibus / Ed. B. R. Suchla (Berlin—New York, 1990), and Corpus Dionysiacum, Vol. II, containing the rest of the corpus, including the treatises on the hierarchies, the *Mystical Theology*, and the Epistles, ed. by G. Heil and A. M. Ritter (Berlin—New York, 1991). Unless otherwise stated, I shall be using the flowing and elegant — though theologically flawed — Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works / Tr. C. Liubheid, ed. P. E. Rorem (New York, 1987).

[2] On the Protestant reception, see the admirable summary essay by K. Froehlich, Pseudo-Dionysius and the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century // Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works… 33–46.

The Roman Catholic approach to the Areopagite is somewhat different. During the Middle Ages, from the twelfth and especially the thirteenth centuries on, he was widely popular, even sensationally so. St. Thomas Aquinas, so I understand, quotes him nearly as often as Scripture, something over a thousand times. Apologists for papal authority saw in his treatises on the hierarchies, *The Celestial* and *The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, apostolic-era support for the vision of church order they were seeking to establish and defend. The mystics of the late medieval Rhineland and of England (e.g., Meister Eckhardt and the author of *The Cloud of Unknowing*), and later on the great spiritual writers of Counter-Reformation Spain, such as SS Theresa of Avila and especially John of the Cross, were likewise well-disposed to Dionysius, especially, once more, to his *Mystical Theology*. Yet, it is also the case that Dionysius was never approached so-to-speak *in toto* by any of his medieval and post-medieval, Western admirers (or detractors, for that matter). Rather, bits of his thought — for example, the appeal of his long treatise on *The Divine Names*, with its *exitus-reditus* scheme of creation and return to God, to Thomas and other masters of speculative divinity, or the notion of hierarchy to the canonists, or the *Mystical Theology* to the enthusiasts of mystical piety — were broken-off and applied, as it were, piecemeal to the several interests of his different admirers. Put briefly, it is an effectively fractured Dionysius that we find at the end of the Western Middle Ages, with larger or smaller chunks of his oeuvre tacked on to — or, as with Aquinas, assimilated with magisterial elegance into — an already well-established and secure theological *Gestalt*.[3] With the Reformation and its aftermath, Catholic attention shifts into a defensive mode, and the Areopagite becomes one element among many — though not a very important one — in the to and fro of debate over the sources and witnesses to tradition. Catholic interest at this point is focused chiefly on defending what we now recognize as indefensible: the apostolic-era provenance of these writings. The advent of modern scholarship, particularly the past century or so, has meant that Catholic scholars, with some notable exceptions, have become generally much more ambivalent, and on occasion actively hostile, toward the *Corpus Dionysiacum*.[4]

What we do not find practically anywhere is much of any true sense of the Dionysian writings as a whole, i.e., what they were, and what they were try-

[3] See J. Leclercq, Influence and noninfluence of Dionysius in the Western Middle Ages // Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works… 25–34; A. Louth, Denys the Areopagite (Wilton, 1989) 121–126; idem, The Influence of Denys the Areopagite on Eastern and Western Spirituality in the 14th Century // *Sob/ECR* 4 (1982) 185–200; and P. E. Rorem, Pseudo-Dionysius: A Commentary to the Texts and an Introduction to their Influence (Oxford—New York, 1993), which touches throughout on Dionysius' appropriation by the medieval Latin West, if from a perspective not at all friendly to Dionysius himself.

[4] See the scholars discussed in the section following.

ing to say, and to whom. I shall argue in the essay following that the chief reason we find no conflict over them in the Christian East, or at least not until the influence of Western scholarship during the twentieth century, is because that was their original milieu. Dionysius is an Eastern Christian writer and, moreover, a monastic one.[5] He wrote to and for monks, and monks in turn — Eastern ones, at least — have always recognized that fact. They understood him then, and in general they still understand him now, because he and they shared common concerns and a common theological, liturgical, and spiritual *Gestalt*. This is then my thesis statement for the remarks which follow, and which I offer as a kind of introit into the «mind» of the Dionysian corpus.[6]

II. Three Question Marks and Three «Nots»: A Brief Look at over a Century of Dionysian Scholarship

The title of my essay, «Dionysius Areopagita: a Christian mysticism», question mark, should therefore really be followed by three question marks. It is widely, though not universally, held that the author of the *Corpus Dionysiacum* was not only not the Dionysius the Areopagite of Acts 17:34, who shows up as one of the very few prizes carried off by St. Paul following the latter's sermon at the altar of the «Unknown God» on Mars Hill, but that he was also neither really a Christian, nor a mystic.

With the first «not» I must agree. The first clearly datable reference to the Dionysian corpus comes to us from the minutes of the colloquium, between opponents and defenders of the Council of Chalcedon, convoked by the Emperor Justinian in 532 in order to put an end to the quarrel over christology, or at least so the emperor hoped. The hope was in vain, as it turned out, but in the course of discussion the anti-Chalcedonians cited one Dionysius the Areopagite who, they said, had lent apostolic-era approval to their position on the single nature of the incarnate Word by writing in his fourth epistle of Christ's «single, divine-human activity». Metropolitan Hypatius of Ephesus, speaking for the pro-Chalcedonian side, replied tartly that, since none of the earlier fathers had mentioned this «apostolic source», he was not about to admit it

[5] This is a point not generally appreciated in the scholarly literature. There is one only article, to my knowledge, devoted to Dionysius' concept of the monk: R. Roques, Éléments pour une théologie de l'état monastique chez Denys l'Aréopagite // Théologie de la vie monastique (Paris, 1961) 283–314, which is excellent as a summary of the Dionysian text, but entirely insensitive to its roots in Christian Syria. I must confess that I am nearly unique in drawing attention to the latter, and quite unique in stressing it as I do.

[6] It is also a kind of offering to my father in God, Aimilianos, retired abbot of the monastery of Simonos Petras, Mount Athos, who provided me with my essential insights into the Dionysian mind.

into evidence, either.[7] In spite of the good Metropolitan's hesitations, Dionysius proved to be an immediate «hit» in the Chalcedonian and even Nestorian (!) worlds as well. The terms he invented, such as most notably the word, «hierarchy», and the phrase, «mystical theology», spread with remarkable speed.[8] Ten or twenty years after the colloquium, Bishop John of Scythopolis in Palestine would write the *Scholia* on the corpus which cemented its reputation and which have accompanied it ever since.[9] Even sooner, perhaps contemporaneously with or even a little before the colloquium, a certain Sergius of Reshaina would translate Dionysius into Syriac, where he immediately shows up in the writings of the rather strange, Syrian Christian mystic, Stephen bar Sudaili.[10] In the following century the greatest theologian of the later Byzantine era, the monk and saint Maximus the Confessor, would hold Dionysius in the highest regard. The Areopagite appears everywhere in Maximus' oeuvre, as he does in that of John Damascene a century later.[11]

[7] Acta Concilium Oecumenicorum / Ed. E. Schwartz (1914) IV.2, 173:13–18.

[8] See, e.g., J. Stiglmayr, Über die Termini Hierarch und Hierarchia // *ZKT* 22 (1898) 180–187.

[9] See B. R. Suchla, Die sogennanten Maximus-Scholien des Corpus Dionysiacum Areopagiticum // *NAG* (1980) 31–66; idem, Eine Redaktion der griechischen Corpus Dionysiacum im Umkreis des Johannes von Skythopolis, des Verfassers von Prolog und Scholien. Ein dritter Beitrag zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Corpus Dionysiacum // *NAG* (1985) 1–18; and, most recently and accessibly, P. E. Rorem, J. C. Lamoreaux, John of Scythopolis and the Dionysian Corpus: Annotating the Areopagite (Oxford, 1998) Esp. 7–45.

[10] On the Syriac transmission of Dionysius, see J.-M. Hornus, Le corpus dionysien en Syriaque // *ParOr* 1 (1970) 69–93; G. Wiessner, Zur Handschriftenüberlieferung der syrischer Fassung des Corpus Dionysiacum // *NAG* (1972) 165–216; and again Suchla, Die sogennanten Maximus-Scholien... 35–36. On Sergius of Reshaina and Dionysius, see P. Sherwood, Sergius of Reshaina and the Syriac Versions of the Pseudo-Dionysius // *SE* 4 (1952) 174–184; and for a French translation of Sergius' own remarks on his translation, idem, Mimro de Serge de Rešayna sur la vie spirituelle // *OrSyr* 5–6 (1960) 433–457, (1961) 95–115 and 121–156. On Sergius as possible author of the Areopagitica, see R. A. Arthur, A New Interpretation of the Context and Purpose of the Pseudo-Dionysian Corpus. Unpub. D. Phil. dissertation (Kings College, University of London, 1998) Esp. 123–127 and 191–192; and as arguing for a close relation between Stephen bar Sudaili and Dionysius, idem, A Sixth-Century Origenist: Stephen bar Sudaili and his Relationship with Pseudo-Dionysius // *SP* XXXV (2001) 369–373. For a translation and introduction to Stephen bar Sudaili, see F. S. Marsh (ed. and trans.), The Book which is called *The Book of the Holy Hierotheus* with Extracts from the Prolegomena and Commentary of Theophilus of Antioch and from the «Book of Extracts» and other Works of Gregory Bar-Hebraeus (London, 1927).

[11] On Dionysius' presence in Maximus, see L. Thunberg, Microcosm and Mediator: The Theological Anthropology of Maximus the Confessor (Chicago, 1995^2) throughout, though esp. 192–195, 408–410, 413–418, 423–426; P. M. Blowers, Exe-

If 532 provides the *ad quem* of the Areopagitica, the *a quo* is usually set at 487, the death of the pagan Neoplatonist philosopher, Proclus Diadochus. Here we arrive at the question mark over Dionysius' Christianity. An anonymous scholiast of Dionysius had noticed, along with others, the strong resemblances — not to say occasional word for word matches — between Proclus and the disciple of St. Paul, Dionysius. The scholiast argued that the pagan had cribbed from the Christian master.[12] Over thirteen hundred years later, in 1895 to be exact, two German scholars, Josef Stiglmayer and Hugo Koch, simply reversed the relationship: Dionysius was dependent on Proclus, not only in the former's account of evil in *Divine Names* IV:18–33, where the match is nearly exact, but, as Koch was successfully to demonstrate five years later, in many other places as well.[13] Modern scholarship on Dionysius dates properly from these two German scholars. The discussion ever since has focused on the nature of Dionysius' undoubted relationship to late Neoplatonism and, following from that, the matter of his ostensible allegiance to the faith of St. Paul and the Gospels. To borrow from Tertullian: given the massive presence of «Athens» in Dionysius' thought, was there any real room — aside from purely verbal acknowledgements — for «Jerusalem»? Put another way: to what degree was (and is) late Neoplatonism compatible with Christianity, and how successful was Dionysius in making the match?

These questions also mark the end of scholarly consensus, as is very clear from the various candidates who have been advanced over the past hundred years for the authorship of the corpus. They range from Orthodox writers to «Monophysites» to pagans, though none of these proposals has ever succeeded in persuading anyone save its particular scholarly advocate.[14] We simply

gesis and Spiritual Pedagogy in Maximus the Confessor: An Investigation of the Quaestiones ad Thalassium (Notre Dame, 1991) Esp. 11–12, 184–185, 252–253; and the two essays by Y. de Andia on Maximus, and on John Damascene by A. Louth, in Y. de Andia (ed.), Denys l'Aréopagite et sa posterité en Orient et en Occident (Paris, 1997).

[12] *PG* 4. 21D.

[13] H. Koch, Proklus als Quelle des Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita in der Lehre von Bösen // *Ph* 54 (1895) 438–454; idem, Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita in seinen Beziehungen zum Neuplatonismu und Mysterienweses (Mainz, 1900); and J. Stiglmayr, Der Neuplatoniker Proklos als Vorlage des sog. Dionysius Areopagita in der Lehre vom Übel // *HJ* 16 (1895) 253–273 and 721–748. See also the latter's equally important article, Das Aufkommen der Ps.-Dionysischen Schriften und ihr Eindrungen in die christliche Literatur bis zum Lateranconcil 649. Ein zweiter Beitrag zur Dionysius Frage // IV Jahresbericht des offentlichen Privatgymnasiums an der Stelle matutina zu Feldkirch (Feldkirch, 1895), which places the Dionysian corpus in Syro-Palestine at the turn of the sixth century.

[14] For a listing of the various attempts to identify Dionysius with one or another figure in pagan or Christian antiquity, see A. Golitzin, *Et introibo ad altare dei*: The Mystagogy of Dionysius Areopagita (Θεσσαλονίκη, 1994) (Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων, 59) 24–25.

do not know who Dionysius was, nor, barring new evidence, will we ever know. We do know roughly the region which he writes from, Syria-Palestine, but we cannot pinpoint it more exactly. These factors, the anonymity, the only very approximate location, and the near half-century between 487 and 532, make it next to impossible to agree — borrowing a phrase from biblical scholarship — on Dionysius' *Sitz im Leben*. Why was he writing at all? for whom? What, as we say nowadays, was his agenda? To these I would add: why was he so readily and enthusiastically received in the Christian East?

The answers to my questions differ among scholars along lines that match the spectrum of proposed authors. For those of Reformed or Lutheran background, from Bishop Anders Nygren in the 1930's to Professor Paul Rorem in the 80's and 90's, Dionysius is at best a failed Christian, if not a pagan wolf in Christian sheep's clothing. Nygren, indeed, sees in the reception of the corpus proof that the Christian world had already and for far too long been drinking much too deeply at Plato's well. That the Medieval West would follow the East —much later and a little disjointedly (recall my remarks above) — in receiving Dionysius with, if anything, even greater enthusiasm, served the Swedish bishop as proof for the need for Luther's rediscovery of *Galatians* and the Reformation's recovery of Pauline Christianity.[15] While this confessional, not to say polemical, current is nearly invisible in Professor Rorem's recent works, it is nonetheless the case that both men, together with nearly all the Protestant scholarship of the sixty years between the two of them, understand Neoplatonist philosophy and Christian faith as mutually antithetical.[16]

Catholic and — to the extent they exist — Orthodox scholars display more variety. Hans Urs von Balthasar and Louis Bouyer, on the Catholic side, with Vladimir Lossky, Andrew Louth, and John Romanides for the Orthodox, applaud the *Corpus Dionysiacum* (which I shall refer to henceforth as *CD*) as both profound in itself and faithful to prior tradition.[17] Another

[15] A. Nygren, Agape and Eros / Trans. P. S. Watson (Philadelphia, rev. ed., 1953) Esp. 576–593, where Dionysius appears as the climax of the betrayal of Christianity to Platonism initiated by the 2nd and 3rd century Alexandrians.

[16] Most of Professor Rorem's works are studiously neutral, at least in their formal presentation. He does, however, specifically mention his belonging to the Lutheran communion in Pseudo-Dionysius: A Commentary… 239, and has recently expressed himself more openly on Dionysius from a Lutheran perspective in Martin Luther's Christocentric Critique of Pseudo-Dionysian Spirituality // *LuthQ* 11 (1997) 291–307, and Empathy and Evaluation in Medieval Church History and Pastoral Ministry: A Lutheran Reading of Pseudo-Dionysius // *PSB* 19.2 ns (1998) 99–115. My thanks to the author for kindly sending me an offprint of the latter essay.

[17] H. von Balthasar, Herrlichkeit: eine theologische Aesthetik (Einseideln, 1964) II. 228–289; L. Bouyer, The Spirituality of the New Testament and the Fathers / Tr. M. Ryan (New York, 1982) 384–392; V. N. Lossky, La notion des «analogies» chez

Catholic, Rene Roques, together with the Orthodox scholars, Georges Florovsky and John Meyendorff, maintain certain reservations, particularly with regard to the Dionysian hierarchies and christology.[18] The Belgian Jesuit, Jean Vanneste, forty years ago, and, very recently, Ysabel de Andia of the Sorbonne see in Dionysius less the Christian than the pagan philosopher, even metaphysician, while a Hungarian Orthodox scholar, Istvan Perczel, has just published a series of articles arguing for the Areopagite as a cunning, deliberately deceptive heretic of the most extreme sort.[19] It was Vanneste, however, who raised in sharpest form the third question mark over my title today, the matter of Dionysius' mysticism — or, rather, the lack of it. For Vanneste, the Areopagite is not a mystic, but a religious philosopher who is less interested in the details of a «vital experience» than in «the exact and tight articulations of [his] conceptual structure».[20] The very symmetry and rigor of his thought, a point which both Vanneste and Professor Rorem bring out in their analyses of, in particular, the *Mystical Theology* (henceforth *MT*) argue for them against the latter treatise as the report or fruit of any actual experience.

How then am I to reply to the question marks, with which I do not agree, over Dionysius' Christianity and mysticism? Perhaps I might begin by quoting one of the few reports of direct experience which we do find in this mysterious author, and where we may also be fairly certain that he is not writing in order to support his pseudonym. Here he is speaking of his own baptism:

Denys le pseudo-Aréopagite // AHDL V (1931) 179–209; and throughout his epochal book, The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church / Tr. A. Moorhouse (London—Cambridge, 1968); Louth, Denys the Areopagite…; J. Romanides, Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics // *GOTR* 6.2 (1960/61) 186–205 and (1963/64) 225–270.

[18] R. Roques, L'Univers dionysien (Paris, 1954); G. Florovsky, The Byzantine Ascetic and Spiritual Fathers. Vol. X of The Collected Works of Father Georges Florovsky (Belmont, 1987) 204–229; J. Meyendorff, Christ in Eastern Christian Thought (Washington, 1969) 75–84.

[19] J. Vanneste, Le Mystère de Dieu (Brussels, 1959); idem, Is the Mysticism of Pseudo-Dionysius Genuine // *IPQ* 3 (1963) 286–306; Y. de Andia, Henôsis: l'union à Dieu chez Denys l'Aréopagite (Leiden—Köln, 1996), though the monograph is not so negative in tone regarding Dionysius' fundamental Christianity as the author's article (cited above, n. 11), and is most commendably sensitive to his patristic background, thus see, e.g., 303–373 for an impressive assembly of patristic parallels to Dionysius' treatment of Moses in Mystical Theology I.3; I. Perczel, Le Pseudo-Denys: lecteur d'Origéne // Origeniana Septima: Origenes in den Auseinandersetzungen des fierten Jahrhuderts / Ed. W. A. Bienert, U. Kühneweg (Leuven, 1999) 674–710; idem, Une théologie de la lumière: Denys l'Aréopagite et Évagre le Pontique // *REAug* 45.1 (1999) 79–120.

[20] Vanneste, Is the Mysticism of Pseudo-Dionysius Genuine?... 290.

> It was this sacrament which first gave me [the power] to see, and, by means of its ruling light, to be led up in light to the vision of the other sacred things.[21]

Elsewhere in the same treatise, the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* (henceforth *EH*), he returns to this idea on at least two other occasions. In chapter 2 he speaks of baptism supplying a spiritual capacity for the sight or vision of the divine light informing Christian worship.[22] In chapter 3, while discussing the formation of catechumens in the «womb» of the Church's «Liturgy of the Word», he notes that, because they are not yet fully formed, they have not yet received «the organs» capable of spiritual sight which are given in baptism.[23] The at least implicit doctrine of the «spiritual senses» here, associated with and indeed given by the Christian sacrament, recalls Origen of Alexandria 300 years before, as well as much of the ascetic literature in the intervening centuries, e.g., in Evagrius of Pontus († 399) and in the late fourth century *Macarian Homilies*. I shall return to the latter a bit further on, but for now I would like to stress, first, that Dionysius, at least in the *EH*, places repeated emphasis on the «divine birth» of baptism, and thus, second, appears to establish the context of whatever «vision» or «experience» of God he may ultimately espouse firmly within the liturgical and sacramental life of his local church.

With this assertion we come up against another question which has greatly exercised Dionysian scholarship: the coherence or, more precisely, the perceived incoherence of the corpus. On the one hand, we have the apparent advocacy of direct encounter and union with God which we find in the *MT*'s account of Moses' ascent, and which Dionysius repeats in at least a dozen passages in his longest treatise, the *Divine Names* (henceforth *DN*). On the the other hand, in the two treatises on the hierarchies, the *Celestial Hierarchy* (henceforth *CH*) and *EH*, we find a repeated insistence on what Fr. Georges Florovsky has referred to as «the staircase principle»,[24] that is, that knowledge of divine things is necessarily mediated. It percolates downwards from the orders of angels around the divine throne through the lower angelic ranks to our hierarchy, to our sacraments and clergy and, finally, through the latter, to the baptized laity. In terms of Dionysius' four treatises, what do the *DN* and especially the *MT* have to do with his meditations on the hierarchies of men and of angels? What is the relation, if any, between the public worship of the Christian Church, its sacraments and ordained ministers, and the direct encounter with God in «the darkness of unknowing»? And, relatedly, what is

[21] *EH* 3.1, 425AB (80:1–4).

[22] *EH* 2.3.3, 400AB (74:15–75:9).

[23] *EH* 3.3.6, 432D–433A (85:11–21): literally, «the [organs] capable of receiving» light, *ta dektika*.

[24] Florovsky, Byzantine Ascetical and Spiritual Fathers... 221.

the connection between his ostensible profession of Christian faith and the obvious use he makes of the late Neoplatonists?

The answers different scholars give once again vary considerably. Fr. Vanneste, and to a lesser degree René Roques, suggested a bifurcation in Dionysius' thought between the «economy» or «theurgy» of the hierarchies, and the «theology», i.e., matters pertaining to the divinity itself, of the *DN* and *MT*.[25] Once the Areopagite's thought is thus divided, there is considerable room allowed — and, in Vanneste's case, insisted upon — for his non-Christian Neoplatonism, and so for the autonomy of the human intellect in its inherent capacity for a «natural union» with divinity that is independent of the Christian appurtenances of scripture, sacraments, and, indeed, of Christ Himself and the Holy Trinity.[26] More recently, Professor Rorem has argued in several books and articles that, to the contrary, Dionysius' thought is altogether united and coherent, but it is this very coherence which Rorem understands as giving the lie to any protestations of Christianity in the corpus. According to his reading, the apophatic «methodology» of the *MT* lies at the center of the corpus and properly precedes the reading of the *CH* and *EH*, an ordering of the treatises (*DN*, *MT*, *CH*, *EH*) which is reflected in Professor Rorem's edition of the English translation of the *CD* for the Paulist Press series, *Classics of Western Spirituality* . Placed thus as, in Rorem's words, the «methodological prologue» to the reflections on scripture and liturgy in the *CH* and *EH*, the *MT* acts as a kind of solvent, burning away the outward Christian trappings in order to reveal, beneath them all, the «timeless» relationship obtaining between the divine as cause and the intellect as effect.[27] Professor Rorem there-

[25] Roques, L'Univers dionysien... 29–30; Vanneste, Mystère de Dieu... 32–35.

[26] Vanneste, Mystère de Dieu... 182–217, perhaps esp. 195–197. Cf. also, on a «natural mysticism» in Dionysius and the late Neoplatonists, J. R. Rist, Mysticism and Transcendence in Later Neoplatonism // *Hermes* 92 (1964) 213–225, here 219. I am happy to add, however, that Professor Rist has subsequently withdrawn this accusation.

[27] The adjective, «timeless», i.e., as indicating the fundamentally «natural» and philosophical or ahistorical — as opposed to Christian — thrust of Dionysius' thought, appears often in Professor Rorem's many works. See, e.g., Rorem, Pseudo-Dionysius: A Commentary... 120, 123, 125, 171, and 239; and on the *MT* as a «methodological prologue» to the treatises on the hierarchies, 209 (and cf. «On the Place of the Mystical Theology», cited below). His other works on Dionysius, in chronological order, include: Iamblichus and the Anagogical Method in Pseudo-Dionysius' Liturgical Theology // *SP* 18 (1979) 543–560; The Place of the Mystical Theology in the Pseudo-Dionysian Corpus // *Dionysius* 4 (1980) 87–98; Biblical and Liturgical Symbols within the Pseudo-Dionysian Synthesis (Toronto, 1984); Moses as the Paradigm for the Liturgical Spirituality of Pseudo-Dionysius // *SP* 18.2 (1989) 275–279; The Uplifting Spirituality of Pseudo-Dionysius // Christian Spirituality. Vol. I: Origins to the Twelfth Century / Ed. B. McGinn, J. Meyendorff, J. Leclercq (New York, 1988) 132–151; and with J. Lamoreaux, John of Scythopolis on Apollinarian Christology and the Pseudo-Dionysius' True Identity // *ChH* 62.4 (1993) 469–482.

fore insists on the *CD* as purely a kind of «head trip», «fundamentally an epistemology», and is likewise obliged to assert — frequently, I might add, in defiance of the text — that Dionysius is simply «devoid of eschatology».[28]

I quite agree with Rorem's assertion of the *CD*'s unity, but decidedly not with his assessment of it. First of all, there are the quite physical facts that a) in *none* of the ancient manuscripts we possess does the *MT* precede the treatises on the hierarchies, and b) that in *all* of the Greek manuscripts the ordering is just as we find it in volume III of Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*: the *CH*, *EH*, *DN*, *MT*, and finally the ten «Epistles». Second, and relatedly, there is the now established fact that the *CD* comes down to us in this order, accompanied by the *Scholia* of John of Scythopolis, from within a generation or two, and perhaps even less, of the corpus' actual composition.[29] Third, I have already noted above how Dionysius himself grounds his very capacity for the vision of «sacred things», by which I take him to mean both the physical sight (not allowed to catechumens) of the sacraments and the spiritual perception of the Presence which informs them, in the grace he received at the «divine birth» of baptism. This in itself would certainly seem to place the *EH* before the *DN* and *MT*, and therefore, fourth, it seems to me clear that we are to read the treatises, including the epistles, in precisely the order in which they have been handed down to us, beginning with the *CH* and ending, not with the *MT*, but with the tenth «Epistle». Fifth, I maintain that doing so will reveal the *CD* as a deliberately progressive «mystagogy», that is, as at once the explication of and the entry into the one and unique mystery, Christ.[30] Before I take up the *CH* and embark on the brief «Cooke's Tour» of the *CD* which I propose for the remainder of this essay, however, I would like first, and in disobedience to my injunction just now, to begin at the end of *CD*, at the brief «Epistle» which is addressed to none other that St. John the Divine, the author — for Dionysius, at least — of both the Fourth Gospel and, as the address of the epistle indicates («To John at Patmos»), of the Apocalypse. I do so because I believe that, read correctly, this little piece reveals a great deal about Dionysius' purposes in writing, at once something of his context and of those who served as both his addressees and his targets.

---

[28] Rorem, Pseudo-Dionysius: A Commentary… 122.

[29] See Suchla, Eine Redaktion der griechischen Corpus Dionysiacum…; and on the proximity of John of Scythopolis' *scholia* to the first appearances of the CD, Rorem, Lamoreaux, John of Scythopolis and the Dionysian Corpus: Annotating the Areopagite… 22–39.

[30] Thus the choice of title for my own book, *Et introibo ad altare dei*... The phrase, taken from the psalms, was prescribed in the old Tridentine missal for the priest, standing at the foot of the altar steps, to begin the Mass. I was pleased by the notes of priesthood, ascent (up the steps), and entry (to the altar) into the mystery of Christ's presence (the Eucharist), together with the OT Temple cultus presumed by the psalm itself (see below and nn. 34–35).

III. *Epistle X*, «To the Apostle John at Patmos», as an Introduction to the *Corpus Dionysiacum*: A Response to Apocalyptic Literature and Visionary Practices Directed to a Monastic Audience

It is surely curious that a writer «devoid of eschatology» should address his concluding remarks to the author of the one and only full-blooded apocalypse to find its way into the NT canon, and do so, moreover, against the background of a Syrian Church which did not accept this book as canonical until very late, indeed. Neither is this the first time Dionysius has mentioned the author of the Apocalypse. In the course of his description of the «Liturgy of the Word» in *EH* 3, he concludes his list of the books of scripture read in the Church with a reference to «the hidden and mystical vision of that inspired man who was the most beloved of the disciples», and then to «his transcendent theology concerning Jesus», which I take to be references, respectively, to the Apocalypse and to the Fourth Gospel.[31] More remarkably still, he asserts at the beginning of Ep X that John is especially dear to him — «more so than for the many», he says — and then again, toward the end, that he is «at present engaged in remembering and renewing the truth of your theology».[32] What, it may fairly be asked, does this writer, whom many see as the most rarified and abstract in all of patristic literature, see in the wild and profuse imagery of the Apocalypse? The attractiveness of the high Christology of the Fourth Gospel, together with the latter's stress on the divine indwelling, is easily comprehensible, but the Apocalypse — with its candlesticks and thrones and seals and cups and descending cubical city 1500 miles on a side decorated with precious stones, furnished with flora (the «trees of life»), fauna (the Lamb and «the four living creatures» of the throne), and waterworks (the «river of life») — what can this strange book mean to the advocate *par excellence* of negative theology, of the denial of even the most exalted ideas to the hidden divinity, let alone the lushly tangible iconography of the Seer of Patmos?

The answer, I think, lies in three elements, two of which are contained or at least suggested in the text itself of the epistle, while the third, though not stated, is, I believe, assumed. The first comes early in the epistle: «Truly», Dionysius writes, «visible things [*ta horata*] are the manifest images [or icons] of the invisible». This is an allusion to R 1.20, which Dionysius has referred to twice before, once in *DN* 4 with reference to «light» as a worthy image of God, and once in Epistle 9 to «fire» in the same context.[33] Light and fire are,

[31] *EH* 3.3.4, 429D (83:21–23).

[32] Epistle X, 1117A and 1120A (208:4–5 and 209:12).

[33] Ibid. 1117B (208:9–10); cf. *DN* 4.4, 700C (149:7–8); and Epistle IX.2, 1108B (199:15–200:1).

indeed, constantly present throughout the *CD*. Much more than the famous «darkness» — about which more anon — it is fire and especially light which are associated throughout the corpus with the *visio dei*.

This is so in turn, I think, because of that unspoken element I just mentioned. The Apocalypse of John, as with the majority of apocalypses characteristic of the intertestamental and early Christian eras, turns around a vision of the divine throne and the heavenly court, imagery which itself derives from the post- and even pre-exilic cultus of the Jerusalem Temple.[34] John's cubical New Jerusalem, for example, finds its ancestry in the eschatological Jerusalem of Ezekiel 40–48, while the latter in its turn takes from the cubical dimensions of the inner sanctuary of Solomon's temple (cf. I K 7). It is at least arguable that John himself is aware of this —for want of a better word — liturgical aspect. He has his vision, after all, «on the Lord's day», the day of the Eucharist, while his portrait of the reconciliation and ultimate identity between the heavenly throne and the world to come he may quite possibly have understood as already anticipated in the worship of the local church. The brilliant and fiery Glory of God, the *kevod YHWH* of the Hebrew and *doxa tou kyriou* of the Greek, surrounded by the dark cloud, is the center of the great theophany on Sinai, and likewise at the literal heart of the Temple, as in I K 8; Is 6; Ezk 1; 9–11; 43, and in many of the Psalms.[35] It is also therefore the subject of the throne visions of Dan 7, of *1* and *2 Enoch*, of Rev 4–5 and 21–22, and, just for example, of the early Christian apocalypse, *The Ascension of Isaiah*.[36] I be-

[34] See, for example, C. Rowland, The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature // *JSJ* 10.2 (1979) 137–154; and at greater length, idem, The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity (New York, 1982) Esp. 78–93 and 193–248; and M. Himmelfard, Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses (Oxford—New York, 1993) Esp. 9–46. On the «Glory of God» in the cult tradition of, particularly, the «Priestly» strain of the Penteteuch, see T. D. N. Mettinger, The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies (Lund, 1982) Esp. 80–123.

[35] On the importance of the book of Ezekiel for later apocalyptic visions of God and the heavenly temple, see again Himmelfarb, Ascent to Heaven… 9–28; together with J. D. Levenson, specifically on Ezekiel 40–48 in: Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40–48 (Missoula, 1976); and more broadly on the Temple, in The Jerusalem Temple in Devotional and Visionary Experience // Jewish Spirituality / Ed. A. Green. Vol. I: From the Bible to the Middle Ages (New York, 1988) 32–62. For a reading of the book of Revelation as fundamentally liturgical, see P. Prigent, Apocalypse et Liturgie (Neuchatel—Paris, 1964). On the «Glory» and *visio dei* in the Psalms, see M. S. Smith, Seeing God in the Psalms: The Background to the Beatific Vision in the Bible // *CBQ* 50 (1988) 171–183; and, more broadly, including Isa 6, Ezk 1, and the theophanies of Exodus: J. M. Vincent, Aspekte der Begegnung mit Gott im alten Testament: Die Erfahrung der göttlichen Gegenwart im Schauen Gottes // *RB* 103 (1996) 5–39.

[36] On the *Ascension of Isaiah*, see A. Acerbi, L'Ascensione di Isaia: Christologia e profetismo in Siria nei primi decenni del II secolo (Milan, 1989) Esp. 50–59 and 138–148. For a translation of the text, see OTP. Vol. 2. 164–176.

lieve that it is no accident that the biblical texts Dionysius discusses throughout his corpus are predominantly, not to say overwhelmingly, associated with these throne visions and related theophanies. This leads me to what I take him to mean when he says he is «carrying on» John's work. He understands himself, in sum, to be linking the liturgical and Glory imagery of the Apocalypse to the interiority of the Fourth Gospel. Put another way, and to anticipate my argument later on in this essay, for Dionysius the Glory of God, the heavenly fire, and especially the divine light, is present in Christ, Who in turn appears on the altar of the consecrated eucharistic elements and in the heart — or intellect — of the baptized Christian.

If we allow Dionysius this background and purpose, and I shall be providing further evidence for them along the way, then we must ask why he believes it necessary to «renew» the Apostle's teaching. I think that we have an important clue in my third element, a passage which comes from close to the middle of Epistle X:

> We also see others who are, here and now, already [*ede*] with God, since they are lovers of truth and withdraw [*anachorousi*] from the passion for material things. They depart with complete freedom from every evil, and with divine love [*eros*] for every good thing, they love [*agaposi*] peace and holiness. They abandon this present life by living in a way [*empoliteumenoi*] which is of the [life] to come, like angels in the midst of [other] men, with total dispassion [*apatheia*], with invocation of the divine name, and with sanctity [*hagioteti*] and everything else that is good.[37]

Who are these angels among men? Two key terms, withdrawl (*anachoreo*) and abandonment (*apoche*), should immediately alert us to the fact that Dionysius is talking about monks. Similarly, the verb, *politeuomai*, here meaning «to live a [disciplined] way of life», together with the nouns, *apatheia* or dispassion, *eros*, and the latter's effective equation with *agape*, both meaning love here, place this passage — as well as other, lengthier ones in the *CD* — in a long prior line of patristic thought to do with asceticism and mysticism, one which runs from Clement and Origen in Alexandria through Gregory of Nyssa in Cappadocia to the great Desert Father and mystic, Evagrius of Pontus. The term sanctity, *hagiotes*, I would take to be Dionysius' Greek rendering of the Syriac word, *qaddishuta*, a *terminus technicus* in the Syrian Church for consecrated celibacy.[38] Finally, the constant «invocation of the divine

[37] Epistle X, 1117B (208:12–209:4).

[38] On early Syriac technical terms for consecrated celibacy, including *qaddishuta*, see S. Griffith, Asceticism in the Church of Syria: The Hermeneutics of Early Syrian Monasticism // Asceticism / Ed. V. L. Wimbush, R. Valantasis (Oxford—New York, 1995) 220–245. For *qaddishuta* in relation to the asceticism of Qumran and the latter's possible relevance for early Christian ascetical terminology in Syriac, see A. Guillaumont, À propos du célibat des Esséniens // idem, Aux origines du monachisme

name» is tantalyzingly reminiscent of later Byzantine hesychasm, or at least of the preoccupation with I Thess 4:17, «pray unceasingly», which we find throughout early monastic literature.[39]

It is the connection with Syria, in particular with Syrian Christian asceticism, which I believe is virtually the royal key to unlocking the mystery which the *CD* has posed for its modern interpreters. One reason, to be sure, that no one has noticed this is that no one to date has thought to look there, with a few partial exceptions.[40] The first puzzle this connection explains is why Dionysius, given his first century pseudonym, should speak of «monks» at all, and even make the seemingly ludicrous claim that the title itself, *monachos*, had originally been given them by the Apostles.[41] The anachronism fades, however, when we take into account a NT apocryphon which is also a document of Syrian provenance, the second century *Gospel of Thomas*, which we know continued to read by Syrian monks throughout the fourth century AD. In *Thomas*, it is the Lord Jesus no less Who speaks of «solitaries», *monachoi*, or, in the likely Syriac original, of *ihidaye* (from the Syriac *had*, «one»).[42]

---

chrétien (Bellefontaine, 1979) 13–23. On monasticism as «the angelic life», see P. Suso Frank, Angelikos Bios: Begriffsanalytische und Begriffsgeschictliche Untersuchung zum «Engelgleichen Leben» im frühen Mönchtum (Münster, 1964). The latter, however, seems quite without any awareness of the fact that joining the angelic priesthood was already extant in Jewish apocalyptic literature. See thus, again, Himmelfarb, Ascent to Heaven… 29–46.

[39] See D. Burton-Christie, The Word in the Desert: Scripture and the Quest for Holiness in Early Christian Monasticism (Oxford—New York, 1993) Esp. 107–133 for constant «rumination» and «repetition» of selected scriptures; and specifically on the «invocation of the name [of Jesus]» in early monasticism, A. Guillaumont, Une inscription Copte sur la prière de Jésus // *OCP* 8 (1977) 187–203 (rep. in Aux origines… 310–325). Repetition of the divine name(s) as means to ascent to heaven appears as early as apocalyptic literature, e.g., *Apocalypse of Abraham* 17–18, on which see I. Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkabah Mysticism (Leiden—Köln, 1980) 29–72, esp. 56–57.

[40] On the Syrian connection, see most notably W. Strothmann, Das Sakrament der Myron-Weihe in der Schrift De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia des Pseudo-Dionysius in syrischen Übersetzung und Kommentaren (Wiesbaden, 1978). See also Louth, Denys the Areopagite… 63–64, 69–70, and 78–98; Golitzin, *Et introibo ad altare dei*... 354–392; together with the scholars noted below, n. 42.

[41] *EH* 6.1.3, 532D–533A (116:15–16): «Whence our divine leaders reckoned them worthy of sacred names, some calling them 'servitors' [or «ministers», *therapeutae*], and others 'monks' [*monachoi*]...» Note that John of Scythopolis' *Scholia* pick up on the use of the word, *therapeutae*, for Jewish ascetics in the first-century work, *de vita contemplativa*, by Philo Judaeus (see *PG* 4. 528A–529B), but that John is conspicuously silent about trying to supply first-century credentials for *monachos*, apparently unaware of the Syrian traditions discussed below and nn. 42–44.

[42] «Jesus said, "Many are standing at the door, but it is the solitary [*monachos*] who will enter the bridal chamber"», *Gospel of Thomas* 75 (see also *logia* 16 and 49),

Later on in the fourth century, in the *Demonstrations* of Aphrahat of Persia and the *Hymns* of St. Ephrem Syrus, we meet bands of these *ihidaye*, the «sons of the covenant» (*b'nai qeiama*), whose relation to the local church precisely matches the Dionysian sketch of the monastic order presented in *EH* 6 and Epistle VIII.[43] These Syrian ascetics are neither grouped in separate communities, in the style of Egypt's Pachomius, nor living away from the towns like the semi-anchorites of Scete or the hermits of Anthony's type. Both Aphrahat's *ihidaye* and Dionysius' monks live in the larger community, take part in and are assigned a special place at the liturgical assembly of the local church, receive their tonsure from the ordained clergy (unknown in Greek monastic literature prior to Dionysius) in a way that is connected with their baptism, and — in Dionysius' case most emphatically — are subject to the direction of the local bishop.[44]

There is no question about the emphatic quality of Dionysius' insistence on this subordination. He devotes time to it in his description of the monks in *EH* 6 and, at much greater length, in his eighth epistle.[45] The addressee of the

tr. T. O. Lambdin, in The Nag Hammadi Library / Ed. J. M. Robinson (San Francisco, 1988) 134. On the presence of *Thomas* in two fourth-century, Syrian ascetical authors, see A. Baker, The Gospel of Thomas and the Syriac *Liber Graduum* // *NTS* 12 (1965) 49–55; idem, Pseudo-Macarius and the Gospel of Thomas // *VC* 18 (1964) 214–225; and G. Quispel, The Syrian Thomas and the Syrian Macarius // *VC* 18 (1964) 226–235. On the relation, perhaps, of origin between the Syriac word, *ihidaya*, and the Greek term, *monachos*, see esp. F.-E. Morard, Monachos, Moine. Histoire du terme grecque jusqu'au IV[e] siècle // *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 20 (1973) 332–411, here 362–377. Note also her references to Dionysius in 335–336 and 405–406, and cf. M. Harl, À propos du *Logia* de Jésus: le sens du mot *monachos* // *REG* 73 (1960) 464–474 (here 473–474); and A. Guillaumont, Monachisme et éthique Judéo-chrétienne // Aux origines du monachisme... 47–66 (here 58), who also relate this archaic use of the term, «monk», in the *Gospel of Thomas* specifically to Dionysius.

[43] See Golitzin, *Et introiboad altare dei*... 354–359.

[44] On Dionysius as the first to assign monastic tonsure to priestly activity, thus placing it under the authority of the hierarchy, see K. Holl, Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum: eine Studie zum Symeon dem neuen Theologen (Leipzig, 1898) 205–207. This is correct, so far as I know, with respect to *Greek* Christian literature, but simply wrong if applied to early Christian writers in Syriac. On the very ancient linkage in Syriac-speaking Christianity between ascetical and baptismal vows, and thus for dedication to sacred «singleness» (*ihidayuta*) as occurring in a decidedly ecclesiastical and liturgical context, see R. Murray, An Exhortation to Candidates for Ascetical Vows at Baptism in the Ancient Syrian Church // *NTS* 21 (1974) 59–80, perhaps esp. 77–80, and note thus Dionysius' explicit parallelism between Baptism and monastic tonsure in *EH* 6.3.4, 536B (118:12–15).

[45] *EH* 6.3.1, 533C (117:19–22); and esp. Epistle 8 in its entirety, 1084B–1100D (171–192). See also the one article I know of that is devoted to the Dionysian monk:

latter is a certain monk Demophilus, whose name I take to mean something like «beloved by the mob». Demophilus has transgressed the hierarchical order, *taxis*, by breaking up the confession of a great sinner. He has beaten the sinner up and chased the confessing priest out of the sanctuary, where he now stands guard over the «holy things», presumably the reserved sacrament, in order to prevent their profanation a second time.[46] Dionysius uses this scenario to expand at length on the virtues of meekness (*praotes*), mercy, and love, which in a very traditional way (reminiscent, in fact, of Evagrius) he understands as the prerequisites for the *visio dei*. Moses, David, and Christ Himself are the exemplars, over against Demonphilus' appeal to Elijah.[47] He goes on, secondly, to the necessity of maintaining the order (*taxis*) given by God. Monks have no authority to enter the altar area, which is here apparently separated off from the nave by a wall and curtain, and even less either to lay hands on the «holy things» or to correct the ordained clergy, even if the latter are in the wrong. This transgression of hierarchy, and thereby of the three great virtues just cited, has come about because Demophilus' own, *inner* hierarchy is itself out of alignment. The latter is instead «to give due place within himself to reason, anger, and to desire». This, Dionysius continues, is «the proper inner order [*taxis*]» without which no one can hope to rule himself, let alone others.[48]

R. Roques, Éléments pour une théologie de l'état monastique chez Denys l'Aréopagite // Théologie de la vie monastique (Paris, 1961) 283–314, esp. 297–304 on relations between monks and clergy. For all its general excellence, Roques' article is still primarily concerned to relate Dionysius' treatment of the monk's «singleness» to Neoplatonic themes, and in consequence it misses entirely important echoes of prior Christian traditions.

[46] Epistle 8.1, 1088BC (175:4–13).

[47] Ibid. 1, 1084B–1088B (171:3–175:4); and 5–6, 1096C–1100C (186:8–192). On the importance of meekness (*praotes*), mercy (*eleos*), and love (*agape*) in Evagrius Ponticus († 399), perhaps the most important architect of Eastern Christian spiritual theory, see G. Bunge, Geistliche Vaterschaft: Christliche Gnosis bei Evagrios Pontikos (Regensburg, 1988) 42–44, and idem, Palladiana II: La version copte de l'*Histoire Lausiaque* // *StMon* 33 (1991) 117–118. The latter is an account of a heavenly ascent Evagrius experiences, and the counsel he receives from a divine voice quite matches the advice Bishop Carpus gets from Christ in the story of the bishop's throne vision which concludes Dionysius' epistle, 1100A–C (190:5–192): God wants «meekness and mercy».

[48] See Epistle 8.1, 1088C (176:3) on Demophilus overturning the «divinely-given *taxis*» of the Church's hierarchy; and 3, 1093A (186:7–8) for his having wronged his own, inner *taxis*. On *taxis* in prior monastic literature as employed for the inner-ordering of the soul, see G. Gould, The Desert Fathers on Monastic Community (Oxford, 1993) 151–152. Behind both uses of the word here in Dionysius, I would see the notion of the divine «pattern» of worship which I discuss below. Note the use of OT tabernacle and temple examples — Uzziah (2 Chr. 26), the entry of the High

Here we arrive at a second and even a third key to the *CD*. The second is the coördination between inner and outer. Implied here, as we shall see when we turn to the opening of the *CH*, is the thought that the visible *pattern* (a term to which I shall return) of Church order — by which Dionysius means primarily the Church as we see it at worship, with its sacraments and its ordered sequence of bishops, priests, deacons, monks, laity, and catechumens, stretching from the inner sanctuary to the church porch — is a divinely-given image or icon of the order which is properly to obtain within the soul. The third key lies in Demophilus' very assumption of authority, together with the suggestion of popular approval which his name seems to imply. Now, examples of monastic zealotry are legion in the Christian East, both then and now, but I think we must look a little deeper. What was the source for the authority which this and other monastic zealots claimed? What did they think gave them the mandate to overrule ordained clergy?

This claim to authority derived from the popular belief, universal throughout the East and especially concentrated in Syria, that the monks were the successors of the seers and prophets of old.[49] More than the local priest, more even than the bishop, who may have been perceived fairly often (and with occasional justice) as less a holy man than a politician, it was the monk who was the Spirit-bearer, pneumatophore, the link in his own person between this world and the one to come. In Syria, particularly, this was a very old tradition. Quite possibly, it lies behind the early second century, Christian apocalypse I cited above, *The Ascension of Isaiah*.[50] Likewise, as very recent scholarship has sought to demonstrate, the *monachoi* in the *Gospel of Thomas* may have represented precisely the same ascetic and visionary currents as run throughout the assorted Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles which were popular reading in the East (and West) in the Early Church, and which retained their popularity well into the fourth and fifth centuries, and even beyond.[51] The *Acts of Judas Thomas* continued to be regular fare in the Syrian

Priest behind the veil (Lev 16:3–4, Ex 30:10, etc.) — in 1089BC (178:1–179:10). Interestingly, in his *Paradise Hymns*, Ephrem Syrus uses much the same imagery for Adam's transgression; see St. Ephrem the Syrian: Hymns on Paradise / Tr. S. Brock (Crestwood, 1990) 93–96 (for *Hymn* 3:7–16).

[49] See most recently P. Escalon, Monachisme et église, le monachisme syrien du IV^e^ au VI^e^ siècle: un monachisme charismatique (Paris, 1999) Esp. 71–123 and, on tensions with the hierarchy, 267–394.

[50] See Acerbi, L'Ascensione di Isaia… 217–253, 289–290.

[51] On the Gospel and Acts of Thomas in the *Macarian Homilies*, see G. Quispel, Makarios, das Thomasevangelium, and das Lied von der Perle (Leiden, 1967) Esp. 8–13, 37–64, and 114–118; on the *Gospel*'s possible setting in Jewish mystical traditions of ascent and vision, see A. DeConick, Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas (Leiden, 1996) Esp. 43–125; and for the same in the *Acts of John*, see J. Fossum, Partes Posteriori Dei: the Transfiguration of Jesus in

Church into early medieval times. It is also in the late fourth century that we find, orginating once again in Syria, a monastic movement which, at least according to its accusers, preached indifference or contempt for the sacraments, and more so for the leadership of the bishops, while holding that the sole access to God was through constant prayer — hence the movement's name, «messalianism», from the Syriac, *tslo'*, to pray.[52] Lastly, at least for our purposes, these monks claimed the possibility of a vision of the Trinity which they said was accessible to their physical eyes.[53] While the movement was condemned in a series of regional episcopal councils beginning in Antioch in the 390's and culminating in the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus in 431, it seems to have continued to exist in the land of its origins, Syria, well into the sixth century, which is to say, into the era of the *CD* itself.[54]

I hope it is clear by now why I have taken so much time over one brief epistle. Dionysius had a problem. He was confronted, as I read him, by a tradition of ancient provenance which, in its extreme form, threatened the Church of the sacraments and bishops. Here, I think, is one very good reason, perhaps even the reason, for his adoption of a sub-apostolic pseudonym. He wished, simply, to answer appeals to ancient tradition with a countervailing antiquity. Another reason, surely, lies in his appeal to philosophical culture in the face of ascetics and their supporters who had no use, in Ephrem Syrus' words, for «the poison of the Greeks». Dionysius thus sets out to write his very own, New Testament pseudepigraphon, precisely in reply to other pseudepigrapha and apocrypha such as those mentioned above. He is «fighting fire with fire», and his choice of pseudonym fits neatly into his intentions: as the philosopher-disciple of St. Paul, he at once invokes the authority of the Apostle, and sustains the legitimacy of deploying the wisdom of the pagans.[55]

---

the *Acts of John* // IDEM, The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology (Freiburg—Göttingen, 1996) 95–108.

[52] On the Messalians, see esp. C. STEWART, «Working the Earth of the Heart»: The Messalian Controversy in History, Texts, and Language to A.D. 431 (Oxford, 1991); and K. FITSCHEN, Messalianismus und Antimessalianismus: Ein Beispiel ostkirchlicher Ketzergeschichte (Göttingen, 1998).

[53] For citation of the texts containing these claims, and commentary on them, see FITSCHEN, Messalianismus… 202–205 and 228–209.

[54] On the durability of the sect in Syria, see again FITSCHEN, Messalianismus… 286–310.

[55] Dionysius' pseudonymity provides a great impetus for the «hermeneutic of suspicion» practiced by his modern interpreters. The imposture must be hiding something dubious. I do not agree that the matter of pseudonymity should of itself justify this suspicion. See with regard to the philosophical culture of the day, B. D. LARSON, Jamblique de Chalcis, exégète et philosophe (Aarhus, 1972) 157, on Iamblichus' choice of a pseudonym for his *de mysteriis aegypti*: «Derrière la pseudonymie dans la littérature philosophique se prouve justement la conception que ce qui est décisif,

It was also in the philosophical culture of the era, specifically in the late Neoplatonism of Iamblichus and Proclus, that he doubtless saw the potential for a reasoned balance and harmony between the subjective experience of ascetic seers, whose capacity for vision I think it clear that he affirmed (recall the «hear and now already with God» of Epistle X above), and the objective, visible liturgy of the Church through which God's presence in Christ is mediated to us. The key here lay in late Neoplatonism's denial of the soul's inherent capacity to ascend — or return — to the One. The latter doctrine had been held by the earlier philosopher and mystic, Plotinus, who also, as Porphyry his biographer tells us, had had in consequence no particular use for the rites of the temples and cults. In contrast, Iamblichus and Proclus believed that it was only through the «ineffable rites» handed down from antiquity that the inherent «weakness of the soul» could be bolstered sufficiently to participate in the divine realm.[56] Now, Neoplatonist theurgy was in practice worlds away

c'est pas qui a dit ceci ou cela, mais au contraire, ce qui est» (emphasis added), i.e., it served to highlight the content rather than the author. On the pseudonymity of scriptural works and of apocryphal literature, see the essays edited by N. Brox, Pseudepigraphie in der heidnischen und jüdisch-christlichen Antike (Darmstadt, 1977), and by K. von Fritz, Pseudepigrapha I: Pseudopythagorica, lettres de Platon, littérature pseudépigraphique juive (Geneva, 1971). My own impression, suggested just above, is that Dionysius deliberately takes over the esoteric language and air of an adept ccommunicating privileged data to a chosen disciple, «Timothy» (intended to recall the addressee of the Pastoral Epistles), in order to «de-gauss», as it were, the apparatus and appeal of the apocryphal and esoteric works circulating among Christian monks of the area. His «secrecy» is in fact a pose. He intends his work to be read by many. It is public, and the esoterica he espouses in, for example, the *DN* turn out in sum to be the «names» of Christian or, more precisely, of scriptural theology. This is the point of his insistence in *DN* 1 on Scripture as the exclusive source of the names he will discuss and, in *EH* 1, on Scripture as the *ousia* of «our hierarchy». It is quite reminiscent of St. Paul: «Nothing beyond what is written!» (I Cor 4:6, and cf. below and n. 146). Thus we have the pseudonymic effect that he wishes to obtain: the philosopher-disciple of St. Paul, initiated into the esoterica of the latter's mystical experiences (e.g., II Cor 12, and cf. n. 146 again), writes down his revelations, and we are led to discover in turn that the latter are nothing other than the common faith of the Great Church, sacramentally based, theologically orthodox. Like Irenaeus, therefore, for Dionysius there really is no esoteric revelation. All is public and open. The *CD*, among other things, is in substance an anti-esoteric work, and this message is conveyed all the more forcefully by the device of the pseudonym. I might note as well that Dionysius' modesty is too seldom pointed out. He was, after all, much more successful than Iamblichus in hiding his personal identity, doing so in order, precisely, to accentuate his message.

[56] See Porphyry's *Vita Plotini* 10, Loeb ed., tr. A. H. Armstrong, 34–35. On late Neoplatonist denial of human autonomy, see J. M. Rist, Pseudo-Dionysius, Neoplatonism, and the Weakness of the Soul // From Athens to Chartres, Neoplatonism and Medieval Thought / Ed. H. J. Westra (Leiden—New York, 1992) 135–161; and on

from Christian liturgy. Dionysius clearly had no interest whatever in its sacred stones, crystals, unpronounceable names, seances, ectoplasm, and moving statues. In the notion, however, of a traditional and ancient worship which claimed to communicate a saving knowledge and communion, and which could moreover demonstrate that it had been received from a divine revelation vastly better documented and more consistent than Proclus' sad appeal to the spurious antiquity of the *Chaldaean Oracles*,[57] I think Dionysius must have seen not only the possibility of a missionary appeal to the pagans (which is the usual account one gets from sympathetic scholars), but, and even more importantly, a way of reconciling the occasionally clashing claims of bishops and monks, of liturgy and mysticism. Even here, though, where he is apparently very «Neoplatonist», he will in fact also be drawing on the thought of Syrian Christian ascetics who had lived over a century before him.

IV. The *Celestial Hierarchy*: Coordination between Heaven, the Liturgy, and the Soul — a Theme from the Ascetical Literature of Early Syrian Christianity

This brings us at last to my promised «Cooke's Tour», and so to the opening chapter of the *CH*. The latter begins by quoting Jas 1.17: «Every perfect gift is from above coming down to us from the Father of lights». We therefore begin with light and its procession to us from God the Father who seeks to «gather us» back to Himself.[58] Let me pause here to note the presence of this word, *synagogos*, «gatherer», applied to the Father and, as we shall see, its echo of the liturgy. The means whereby the Father gathers us to Himself, Dionysius then tells us, is «Jesus, the light of the Father, "the true light enlightening every man coming into the world", "through Whom we have obtained access [*prosagoge*] to the Father"».[59] The combination here of the Fourth Gospel and of St. Paul is worth noting in itself, but I should like particularly to underline the word, «access», *prosagoge*. It is in Christ, for Dionysius, that we discover our unique entry into the presence of divinity. The same word will appear again in a key text from the *EH*, and will be presumed when we come to the *MT* and the first five epistles concluding the corpus.

Iamblichus and theurgy in particular, G. Shaw, Theurgy and the Soul: The Neoplatonism of Iamblichus (Penn State, 1995) Esp. 237 ff. For older, but still useful considerations of theurgy, see E. R. Dodds, Theurgy and its Relation to Neoplatonism // *JRS* 37 (1947) 55–69; and A.-J. Festugière, Proclus et la religion traditionelle // Mélanges Piganiol (Paris, 1966) 3:1581–1590.

[57] See H. Lewy, The Chaldean Oracles and Theurgy: Mysticism, Magic, and Platonism in the Later Roman Empire (Paris, new ed., 1978).

[58] *CH* 1.1, 120B–121A (7:3–8); *synagogou* on ll. 6–7.

[59] *CH* 1.2, 121A (7:9–11).

In the following paragraph, *CH* 1.3, we arrive at the manner and means of that access which Christ has given us. This is arguably the most important passage in the entire *CD*:

> It would not be possible for the human intellect [*nous*] to be ordered with that immaterial imitation of the heavenly minds [i.e., the angels] unless it were to use the material guide that is proper to it, reckoning the visible beauties as reflections of the invisible splendor, the perceptible fragrances as impressions of the intelligible distributions, the material lights an icon of the immaterial gift of light, the sacred and extensive teaching [of the scriptures] [an image] of the intellect's intelligible fulfillment, the exterior ranks of the clergy [an image] of the harmonious and ordered state [*hexis*] [of the intellect] which is set in order *tetagmenas*] for divine things, and [our partaking] of the most divine Eucharist [an icon] of our participation in IC.[60]

Dionysius is obviously talking about the liturgy, with its candles, incense, scripture readings, orders of clergy, and sacraments. The whole is a symbol, which for him means always a kind of incarnation, a 'real presence' of God and heaven coming to us in and through the material forms and objects — bread and wine, oil and water — which we have received from the teachings of Christ and the traditions of the Apostles. This symbol which is the liturgy unites three different levels: the visible and material elements of our worship, the invisible and spiritual (or «intelligible», *noetos*) world of the angelic liturgy about the throne of God, and the inner world of the believer's soul or intellect (*nous*). The first two together, that is, the Church's worship as a reflection of and participation in the worship of heaven, is a very old idea, perhaps even, as I noted above, reflected in the Apocalypse of John.[61] It is in the third level, in the coördination between the interior hierarchy of the soul and the liturgy, that Dionysius offers us his apparently «novel» contribution.

My reasons for the inverted commas around «novel» will appear in a moment. For now, I should like to stress that this coördination between the «inner» and the «outer» hierarchies of the soul and Church appears throughout the treatises on the hierarchies. For example, two chapters later, in *CH* 3, Dionysius gives us his definition of hierarchy as

> «...a sacred order [*taxis*], knowledge [*episteme*], and activity [*energeia*] assimilated so far as possible to the form of God [*to theoeides*] and leading up in due proportion to the illuminations given it by God».[62]

Its purpose (*skopos*), he continues, is to make its members «images [*agalmata*] of God... clear and spotless mirrors reflecting the primordial light»,[63]

[60] *CH* 1.3, 121C–124A (8:19–9:6).

[61] See above, nn. 34–35.

[62] *CH* 3.1, 164D (17:3–5).

[63] *CH* 3.2, 165A (17:10–18:4).

which is to say that «hierarchy» refers both to the collective, that is, in our case to the worshipping Church, and to the individual Christian. Both, with the latter arriving at it in and through the former, are called to be the *imago dei*, and thus to become vessels of the divine light. Recall in my citation of *CH* 1.3 above that he called the ranks (*diakosmeseis*) of the clergy an image or icon of that condition or state, *hexis* (like the Latin *habitus*), of the inner man which is open to — literally, «set in order for» — the reception of divine things. Now remember our examination above of the problem posed in Epistle VIII by the monk, Demophilus. The latter disrupted the sacred order, *taxis*, of the Church, which Dionysius consistently refers to as «our hierarchy» (the collective), because the inner order, *taxis*, of his soul (the individual) was already out of order. Demophilus had, in short, refused to allow the shape or *pattern* of the liturgy precisely to shape or form his inner man, and had thus, as Epistle VIII also makes clear, rendered himself opaque to the vision of God. The liturgy is therefore for Dionysius not merely a sign — a «symbol» in the weak, modern sense — but a shaping force without which no one can attain to the encounter with God within. It is in this sense that we are to understand Dionysius' insistence in the *CH* and elsewhere on the «hierarchic principle», for example in *CH* 8: «that beings [here, angels] of the second rank receive enlightenment from God through the beings of the first rank»,[64] a principle which, applied to «our hierarchy», means the authority of the clergy. Two chapters later, however, we find the same principle applied to the inner life: «Every being endowed with intelligence...has its own set of primary, middle, and lower orders and powers».[65] Likewise, and a final example, in *EH* 3, which is devoted to the Eucharist, Dionysius refers to this sacrament as the *synaxis*, from *synago*, to gather together (and recall in *CH* 1.1 above the Father as *synagogos*, gatherer). At one point he applies this to the individual: the Eucharist is that sacrament which «gathers together into unity the divisions *within* us»,[66] and then, later in the chapter, to the collective, where it is the function of the Eucharist to bring us together without divisions «*among* ourselves».[67]

I could multiply examples, but these must suffice to illustrate my point: Dionysius does not believe in the autonomous human intellect. The latter is neither capable of, nor free to approach the Godhead on its own. It requires the liturgy, the community of the Church, to form it and render it *capax dei*. Here, to be sure, we can certainly point to a parallel in the late Neoplatonist notion of theurgy, the «ineffable» and immemorial rites which alone can afford the presence of the gods to a soul too weak by nature to ascend to them

[64] *CH* 8.2, 240D (34:14–16).
[65] *CH* 10.3, 273C (40:23–41:2).
[66] *EH* 3.1, 424C (79:9–12).
[67] *EH* 3.3.8, 437A (88:13–18).

by itself. The parallel is obvious, and I freely grant that Dionysius made use of it. It may even have been what attracted him to Proclus and company in the first place. Let me add two caveats, however. There is first the certainty that Dionysius felt that he had a superior revelation and better — much better — rites. The pagans were obliged to turn Plato into holy writ and to rely on the dubious and late mystagogy of the *Chaldean Oracles*. The Christian writer, by contrast, could and did point to the incontestably revelatory claims of Scripture, together with a liturgy that could document a pedigree going back to the Apostles, and still further to an even more distant, if transformed, ancestry in the cult of the Jerusalem Temple and, indeed, even before Solomon, to the worship of the tabernacle revealed to Moses on Sinai (Ex. 25:9 ff.) as, exactly, the divinely-given *pattern* of worship[68] The imagery of the Old Testamental Temple, not accidentally I think, is ubiquitous throughout the *CD*.[69]

[68] «In accordance with all that I show you concerning the pattern [Hebrew *tabnit*, LXX *paradeigma*] of the tabernacle and of all its furniture, so shall you make it»; Ex 25:9 (NRSV). Cf. Dionysius' discussion of the «three hierarchies» — the «legal hierarchy» (*he kata nomon hierarchia*), «our hierarchy» (*he kath' hemas hierarchia*), and the angelic hierarchy — in *EH* 5.1.2–4, 501B–503A (104:15–107:12). The discussion is in great part based on, and flows out of Exod. 25:9 ff., thus the explicit reference to Sinai and the tabernacle in 5.1.2, 501C (105:11–16). Throughout, the assumption behind the discussion supposes the modeling of human worship on the liturgy of heaven, less perfectly in the case of the OT cultus, more perfectly in the Christian, and cf. Heb 10:1, the distinction between «shadow», *skia*, and «image», *eikon*. That Dionysius is in accord here with ancient and contemporary traditions (esp. lively in Syria) concerning the tabernacle/temple and Christian Church, see for example N. Séd, Les *Hymnes sur le paradis* de saint Ephrem et les traditions juives // *Mus* (1968) 455–501, here 458–465 and 476–477. For the OT and later Jewish thought, see again Levenson, The Jerusalem Temple in Devotional and Visionary Experience…; J. D. Levenson, Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible (San Francisco, 1985) Esp. 89–184; and R. Patai, Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual (New York, 1967[2]).

[69] See *CH* 1.3, 124A (our hierarchy assimlated to the angelic priesthood); 4.3, 180C (angels as initiators); 7.2, 208A (highest angels as «gates», *prothyroi*, to the sanctuary of divinity); 7.4, 212B (echoes of Ezk 3:12 and Isa 6:3, also angels as the «place» of divine «rest»); 8.2, 241A–C (angels as priests, echoing Ezk 9; 10:6–8; and Zech 1:3 and 2:4); 13.4, 304C–305B (Isaiah's «initiation» into the liturgy of heaven); 15.4, 333AB (angels with priestly vesture); *EH* 1.1, 372AB (Jesus established our priesthood); 4.3.5–6, 440B–D (Seraphim around Christ as priests around the bishop); 5.1.2, 501BC (see above, n. 68); 5.1.7, 508CD (clergy as icon of divine energies); *DN* 1.8, 597AB («visions» englightening «prophets in the holy places», echoing Ezk. 9–11, Ex 24 and 33–34, and Rev 4–5); 4.2, 696B («to reflect the light glowing in the inner sanctuary», i.e., the heavenly *debir*); 4.22, 724B (an angel as a «mirror... enlightening within itself... the goodness of the silence of the inner [heavenly] sanctuaries»); 5.2, 816C (Godhead's foundation «in a secret place», cf. Ps 80:8); 5.8, 821C (highest angels as again *prothyroi* of the Trinity); *MT* 1.1, 997AB (a likely echo of the darkness of the *debir* in the «brilliant darkness of the hidden silence»); 1.2, 1000AB

My second caveat refers back to the inverted commas I placed around the «novelty» of Dionysius' contribution regarding the coordination of the inner and outer liturgies, and thus to my earlier remark that he was drawing upon a Syrian Christian literature that antedated him by over a century. Here I have in mind primarily three fourth-century Syrian writers, Ephrem Syrus († 373), and the anonymous authors of the *Liber Graduum* (*Book of Steps*) and the *Macarian Homilies*.[70] The first two wrote in Syriac and the third in Greek. The last two in particular were also concerned especially with what I argued in my discussion of Epistle VIII was Dionysius' fundamental goal: the reconciliation of ascetics, especially of ascetic visionaries, to the liturgy and sacraments of the Church. These earlier Syrian writers were themselves involved with the ascetic movement — or, perhaps better, bundle of traditions — which was later to be condemned as Messalianism, and they, too, were anxious to propose a solution to the dangers which they saw that movement, with which they had much in common, posing for the life of the Great Church.[71] The outlines of their solution match those of Dionysius. Indeed, the match is on occasion virtually exact, as in the following from Macarius which my citation from *CH* 1.3 echoes over a century later:

(«darkness his hiding place», cf. Pss 18:11 and 80:8); 1.3, 1000CD (the «place of God» to which Moses ascends, cf. Ex 24:10); Epistle 5, 1073A–1076A (the «darkness» and «unapproachable light» in which God dwells, cf. I Tim 6:16); Epistle 8.1, 1089BC (see above, n. 48); 8.6, 1100AC (appearance of Christ on heavenly throne, «shining flame», surrounded by angels). To these I might add *CH* 2, esp. 1–2 and 5, 137A–D and 145B (almost exclusively devoted to Ezk 1); the entirety of chapters 13, 300B–308B, on Isa 6:1–6; and 15, esp. 2–5, 328C–340B (again almost exclusively devoted to Ezk 1 and 9–11); *DN* 9.5, 912D–913B (alluding to the OT theophanies in bodily form); and 10.2, 937B (echoing Dan 7:9 and 13). This list does not claim to be comprehensive. I am merely noting the passages which most forcibly struck me.

[70] For Ephrem, see the translation by Brock, Hymns on Paradise… (cited above, n. 48); and for the *Liber Graduum*, M. Kmosko's edition of the Syriac text with facing Latin translation in *PS* III. Macarius' homilies and letters exist in four medieval collections, three of which enjoy critical editions: Makarios/Symeon: Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung I des Vaticanus Graecus 694 (B). 2 vols. / Ed. H. Berthold (Berlin, 1973); Die 50 geistlichen Homlien des Makarios / Ed. H. Dörries, E. Klostermann, M. Kröger (Berlin, 1964); and V. Desprez, Pseudo-Macaire. Oeuvres spirituelles. Vol. I: Homélies propres à la Collection III (Paris, 1980) (SC, 275). There is a handy translation of Collection II by G. Maloney, Pseudo-Macarius: The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter (New York, 1992).

[71] For discussion, see Golitzin, *Et introibo ad altare dei*… 371–385. Note that for long both the *Liber* and, especially, Macarius were themselves confused with the Messalian heresy. For Macarius as «Messalian», see, e.g., A. Louth, The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition: From Plato to Denys (Oxford, 1981) 113–125. It is the great merit of Stewart, «Working the Earth of the Heart»… and Fitschen, Messalianismus… (both cited above, n. 52), to have cleared up this confusion.

> Because visible things are the type and shadow of hidden ones, and the visible temple [a type] of the Temple of the heart, and the priest [a type] of the true priest of the grace of Christ, and all the rest of the sequence of the visible arrangement [a type] of the rational and hidden matters of the inner man, we receive the visible arrangement and administration of the Church as a pattern [*hypodeigma*] [of what is] at work in the soul by grace.[72]

Once again, we find the language of a divinely-given *pattern* of worship. Christ came, the same writer says a little earlier, and gave us the «icon of the Church» in order that «faithful souls might be made again and, having received transformation [*metabole*], be enabled to inherit everlasting life».[73] The liturgy is thus not merely a sign or projection of the soul outwards, but, as in Dionysius later on, a transforming force molding the soul from within.

The *Liber Graduum*, whose author is confronted by certain ascetics living away «off on the Mountain» and disdaining the liturgy and sacraments, offers an exactly similar coördination between, as he puts it, the «three churches»: the heavenly church, the earthly church of sacraments and clergy, and the «little church» of the heart. It is the middle term, he insists, the earthly church, which enables the Christian «to find himself in the Church of the heart and [thence] in the Church on high».[74] Finally, and apparently outside of any controversy, Ephrem Syrus' *Hymns on Paradise* offer a striking set of parallels between: (1) the Paradise Mountain; (2) Sinai; (3) the Jerusalem Temple; (4) the Christian Church; and (5) the human being. On the peak of the Paradise Mountain enthroned on the Tree of Life, on the summit of Sinai, within the holy of holies of the Temple, on the altar of the Church, and in the innermost chambers of the human spirit we find Christ.[75] Ephrem also, on at least one occasion, refers to Christ's presence as the *Shekinta*, i.e., he deploys the

---

[72] Makarios/Symeon: Reden und Briefe… Homily 52.2.1 (vol. II. 140, lines 3–8). See A. Golitzin, Liturgy and Mysticism: The Experience of God in Orthodox Christianity // *Pro Ecclesia* 8.2 (1999) 159–186, here 176–179, for further discussion of Macarius.

[73] Ibid. 1.6, 139:30–140:2. The «transformation», *metabole*, is here a deliberate evocation of the change of the Eucharistic elements. On Macarius' frequent use of liturgical imagery and terminology for the inner condition of the soul, see Golitzin, Liturgy and Mysticism… 177–179, and at greater length: idem, *Et introibo ad altare dei*... 379–385.

[74] *Mimra* 12.2, *PS* III, 288:20–289:8. See also the English translation of this discourse, in S. Brock, The Syriac Fathers on Prayer and the Spiritual Life (Kalamazoo, 1987) 45–53, here 46–7. The similarity between Macarius and the *Liber* in their effort to coördinate the worship of heaven, the church, and the soul, was first noted by R. Murray, Symbols of Church and Kingdom: A Study of Early Syriac Tradition (Cambridge, 1975) 262–276.

[75] On these parallels, see Brock's «Introduction» to the *Hymns on Paradise*… 46–57, esp. the chart he supplies on p. 54.

same word (in its Syriac form) as the *Shekinah* of the Rabbis, who in their turn use it to mean the radiant manifestation of God, the divine Glory abiding in Israel. For Ephrem, and I think also for Dionysius, though he never uses that term, this radiance and splendor of God in Christ abides in the Church and in the Christian.[76] It is the secret within the complementary sanctuaries of the Church and the heart.

There are in fact a number of fascinating echoes of St. Ephrem in the *CD*, including the former's use of another word, *raza*, which he employs in a way very akin to the dionysian use of *symbolon*, symbol, both for what we might call the symbolic discourse of Scripture, the names of God in particular, and for the sacraments themselves.[77] In both writers there is a continual to and fro between the poles of hidden and revealed, God present in His «symbols» or «mysteries» and at the same time veiled by them. For our purposes, though, it is particularly Ephrem's parallels between Sinai, Church, and the soul that I should like us to bear in mind, since I think that they provide us with a key that unlocks the relationship which obtains for Dionysius between the two treatises, the *EH* and, especially, the ascent of Moses up Sinai which begins the *MT* and provides the setting for the latter treatise's concluding series of negations.

V. The «Architecture» of the Church at Worship in *The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*: «Bracketing» all of Christian Life

We turn then to the *EH*, «our hierarchy», the Church. By the latter, Dionysius means essentially the Church at worship. It is composed of three triads, like the three triads of the angelic orders in the *CH*, save that in our case the

[76] *Hymns on Paradise* 2.11 (Brock, 89). For the Syriac, see E. Beck (ed.), Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers: Hymnen de Paradiso (CSCO, 174) 7, line 28. The term, *šekinta*, turns up with some frequency in Christian writers in Syriac. I have come across it Aphrahat (fl. 340s), Jacob of Serug († 521), and Isaac of Nineveh († ca. 690), where each time, I believe, it signals the presence of Christ. To my knowledge, however, this usage has not yet attracted any scholarly attention. For the rabbinic usage of *šekinah*, see A. M. Goldberg, Untersuchungen über die Vorstellung der Shekinah in frühen rabbinischen Litteratur (Berlin, 1969); and in the targumim, D. Muñoz-Leon, Gloria de la Shekinta en los targumim de Penteteucho (Madrid, 1977). For its use in Jewish mystical texts, see I. Chernus, Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism: Studies in the History of Midrash (Berlin—New York, 1982) Esp. 74–87. On echoes of these traditions in Dionysius, see my discussion of *MT* 1.3 and Epistles 1–5 below, and, in more detail: A. Golitzin, Revisiting the 'Sudden': Epistle III in the *Corpus Dionysiacum* // *SP* XXXVII (2001) 482–491, esp. n. 3, 482–483.

[77] See E. Beck, Symbolum-Mysterium bei Aphraat und Ephräm // *OC* 42 (1958) 19–40; and R. Murray, The Theory of Symbolism in St. Ephrem's Theology // *ParOr* 6–7 (1975/76) 1–20.

first triad is composed of the sacraments of baptism, eucharist, and the consecration of the sanctifying perfumed oil, the *myron*, used to anoint the newly baptized and to consecrate the altar. It might strike us nowadays as unusual to rank the consecration of the oil as a sacrament, but this was apparently commonly believed in the Syrian Church of the era.[78] Likewise, the bottom triad of monks, baptized laity, and catechumens/penitents also might appear odd or contrived, but once more we see exactly the same sequence of three grades in Ephrem's *Paradise Hymns*[79] In between, mediating the sacraments to the laity, we find the triad of sacred ministers — bishops, presbyters, and deacons (whom Dionysius calls hierarchs, priests, and ministers — *leitourgoi*) — familiar to us from at least the days of another Syrian, Ignatius of Antioch († 115), who is, interestingly enough, the only Church Father whom Dionysius feels free to cite by name.[80] Every one of these triads is therefore traditional, though the *EH* is the first to assemble them in precisely this sequence. One reason for this assembly, aside from the undoubted Neoplatonism of triads within triads (which has drawn most of the scholarly attention), is surely Dionysius' wish to emphasize the mediating role of the clergy, particularly with respect to the monks.

It is on the design or «architecture» of the *EH* that I should like dwell here, while recalling the mountain imagery we saw in Ephrem and will see in the *MT*. The treatise features two primary movements, the first into the mystery of the altar and culminating in the meditation on it at the end of chapter 4 on the *myron*, and the second moving away from the altar as the reader is led through successive meditations on clerical ordination, accomplished within the sanctuary in chapter 5, to monastic tonsure, done in front of the sanctuary gates in chapter 6, to the concluding chapter 7, on Christian burial, which begins in the nave and finishes by taking us out of the church building on the way to interment. We thus enter the Church through baptism, commune at the eucharist, reflect on the altar itself, and then trace the movement of divine grace moving down from the altar in order to finish once again «outside the doors» of the Church in hope of the Resurrection. Chapters 2, on baptism, and 7, on burial, constitute a kind of «bracket» which encloses the whole of Christian life. Dionysius speaks in fact of two births and two deaths. The first birth is of course the «divine birth» of baptism where, as we saw above, we receive the «eyes of the mind» capable of perceiving divine things, and which we are given through participation in the figurative death of baptismal im-

[78] See esp. Strothmann, Das Sakrament der Myron-Weihe…

[79] See *Hymns on Paradise* 2.10–11, (Brock, 88–89); and, for comment on this triad, Murray, The Theory of Symbolism in St. Ephrem's Theology… 9.

[80] *DN* 4.12, 709B (157:10–11). For Ignatius' triad of clergy, see for example his letter *To the Phillipians* 4.

mersion, in imitation of Christ's death and burial. The literal death of the Christian in chapter 7 looks forward to the «rebirth» *[paliggenesia]* of the resurrection precisely in fulfillment, as Dionysius is careful to stress, of the baptismal promise.[81] Thus, while describing the sacramental rites and offices of the visible church, the *EH* simultaneously represents, enclosed within those brackets, the Christian's existence, hope of the world to come, and possibility of communion with God in this life. Once more, in short, we find that principle of coördination between macrocosm and microcosm, outer and inner, objective and subjective, institutional and personal, which I stressed above in connection with *CH* 1.3 and the latter's background in Syrian ascetical literature.

Space permits me to dwell only on one text from the *EH*, but I think it an essential one. It is the passage referred to above at the conclusion of *EH* 4. This is simultaneously the climax of the first movement, the entry or «introit» into the mystery of the Church and, if I may borrow from St. Ephrem's imagery, the summit of the ascent of the Church as the mountain of God. Given the latter image, I think this passage also has a direct relation to Dionysius' use of Mount Sinai in the *MT*. After describing the rite of the sacred oil's consecration, an action which takes place entirely within the veiled sanctuary (and hence, perhaps, one reason he has chosen this sacrament as the background for his concluding reflections on the movement into the mystery), Dionysius begins his contemplation, *theoria*, with a lengthy discussion of the saints. It is these people, he tells us, who *«are* the truly divine images of that infinitely divine fragrance»[82] which has taken up its lodging «within their minds», and, as he makes clear a few paragraphs later, that fragrance is the presence of Jesus.[83] After an extended consideration of the seraphim gathered about Christ in heaven, as typified by the clergy around the bishop at the altar, and following repeated reflections on the Incarnation, he sums up his remarks on the altar and on our participation in Christ with the following:

> The theurgy [by which term Dionysius always means the Incarnation] transcends the heavens and is superessential. It is the origin, essence, and perfecting power of all our divinely-worked sanctification. For if our most divine altar is Jesus, Who is [both] the divine consecration of the heavenly intelligences [i.e., the angels] [and He] in Whom we, according to the saying, being at once consecrated and in mystery wholly consumed [lit. be-

[81] *EH* 2.1, 392AB (69:3 and 7) for Baptism as *anagennesis* and *gennesis*; and 7.1 and 3, 553A and 556B (120:23 and 123:15) for the *paliggenesia* of the Resurrection anticipated in Christian burial. Note also Dionysius' specific indication of the funeral service's appeal to, and parallel with, the «divine birth (*theia gennesis*) of Baptism in 7.3.8, 565A (129:15–22).

[82] *EH* 4.3.1, 473B (95:21–96:5).

[83] *EH* 4.3.4, 480A (99:8–14).

> come whole burnt offerings, *holokautomenoi*], have our access [*prosagoge*] [to God], let us gaze with supramundane eyes on this most divine altar, by whom all that is being perfected is perfected and sanctified, made perfect by Him Who is Himself [also] the most divine *myron*.[84]

In this passage, we find, first of all, the reference to the holy man whom Dionysius sees as typified by the sacrament; second, the coördination between heaven and earth, the liturgies around the divine throne and the Christian altar; and, third, the identification of both altars, on high and here below, with the God-man, Jesus. Thus we encounter, yet again, the harmony or mutual reflection established between not only the liturgies of heaven and earth, but as well between both the latter and, to borrow from the *Liber Graduum*, the «little church» of the individual Christian. I have a fourth point, too, and that lies in what I take to be the relation — indeed, perhaps even the functional identity — between the passage quoted here and Moses' entry into the divine darkness in the *MT*. We enter into God through God, and God for Dionysius here means Christ. We do so as both «consecrated and, in mystery, wholly consumed». I cannot help but see a direct relation between this holocaust on the peak of the «Mountain of the Church» (borrowing now from St. Ephrem's imagery), and the divine darkness on Sinai into which Moses plunges in the *MT*, stripped of every concept and of all human knowing. In both passages, we must be «burned up» altogether, as it were, in order to enter fully into God. Put in more pedestrian terms, I take this passage as the context, so to speak, for the apophaticism of the *MT*. It is the Church, the body of Christ, which is for Dionysius the divine milieu, the «place» of encounter with God, the *topos theou*, and therefore also the place for our considerations of the following treatises, the *DN* and the *MT*. But what then of that «dazzling darkness» of divinity which we shall meet in the latter treatise? That too, as we shall see, is Christ.

[84] *EH* 4.3.12, 484D–485A (103:4–9). Cf. the description of the sanctified believer as a «holocaust» (*holokautoma*), offered up by Christ the High Priest and consumed by «spiritual fire», in Homily 7.2 in Collection III of the Macarian homilies: Pseudo-Macaire. Oeuvres spirituelles… 118–121, esp. 118:1–12, with lines 4 and 10 for *holokautoma* and *holokarpoma*, resp. The image is also reminiscent of second-century descriptions of the Christian martyr as sacrificial offering and, indeed, as a kind of sacrament making God present. See, e.g., Ignatius himself in *Romans* and Polycarp in the *Letter of the Smyrneans*. For citation and discussion of the latter texts, see Golitzin, *Et introibo ad altare dei*... 243–247, together with R. D. Young, In Procession before the World: Martyrdom as Public Liturgy in Early Christianity (Milwaukee, 2001) Esp. 9–24.

VI. The *Divine Names*: Notes of Eschatological Anticipation and on «Spiritual Fatherhood» as Illustration of the Trinity

The long treatise of the *DN*, which has fascinated so many generations of systematic theologians, especially the great Scholastics, will not detain us as long as it should. The first three chapters do, however, require a brief consideration.

Chapter 1 sets out the basis of discussion, beginning with an opening appeal to the apophaticism which also closes the treatise in chapter 13 and leads naturally into the MT: «God is properly known through an «unknowing» (*agnosia*) beyond mind and speech.[85] Dionysius moves on to declare that the treatise is to be limited entirely to «what scripture has disclosed» in the «hidden depths» of the names it has given God,[86] names which, as he implies elsewhere, are, we might say, sacramental in their character.[87] They carry the divine presence. Section 3 of the chapter asks its readers to «lift up» their eyes to this «divine light», and continues its praise of the light in ways which, to my ear, recall key terms of Syrian Christian asceticism. The divine light of scripture is «safety for those make a stand... simplicity for those turning toward simplicity».[88] The fourth section is also one of the keys to the treatise and, indeed, to the entire corpus. Dionysius begins it by recalling the Trinity, God as monad and triad, and then the Incarnation, where God «became complex» by entering «into our human nature».[89] In what follows, this «complexity», the «vesture» we might say of the Incarnate God — or, in

[85] *DN* 1.1, 585D–588A (108:4, for *agnostos,* and 9, for *agnosia* «beyond reason [*logos*] and intellect [*nous*]»), and for the closing appeal to apophaticism, see 13.3, 981AB (229:15–230:5).

[86] *DN* 1.2, 588C (110:2–4), repeating what he has already said in 1.1, 588A (108:6–8).

[87] See, e.g., *DN* 1.8, 597BC (121:4–15), where Dionysius speaks of interpretation of the divine names in terms and phrases which deliberately evoke the *disciplina arcana* traditionally (at least from the fourth century) applied to the sacraments, e.g., «holy things are for the holy» (121:9–10), still sung today in the Orthodox Church prior to the fraction and priest's communion. Cf. also 9.1, 909B (207:8), on the divine names as *theia agalmata*, «divine images» or «icons», and, for discussion, Golitzin, *Et introibo ad altare dei*... 70–74.

[88] *DN* 1.3, 589A–C (111:3–112:6), with esp. 589C (121:16–112:2) for the terms which remind me of the lexicon of Syrian asceticism: «those who stand» (111:16), «simplicity» and «oneness of those being unified» (112:2). The first, «standing», recalls the *qeiama*, «covenant», of the ascetics, but whose root is «stand» (*qwm*), while the last two evoke the *ihidaya*, or «single one», the root of which is *hd*, «one». On the several resonances of *qeiama* and *ihidaya*, see again Griffith, Asceticism in the Church of Syria… (above, n. 38), esp. 223–234.

[89] *DN* 1.4, 589D–592B (112:7–114:7).

Dionysius' phrase, the «veils» of God's love for humanity (*philanthropia*) — are specifically equated with the scripture and liturgy (= «the hierarchical traditions») which establish the possibility of our approach to the divine mystery «now», i.e., in this life. «But THEN», as he continues, in the age to come:

> We shall... be filled, on the one hand, with pure contemplation of His most visible theophany, shining round us with manifest brilliance as it shone round His disciples at the divine Transfiguration, and, on the other hand, we shall [also] participate in His noetic gift of light with our intellects grown passionless and immaterial; and [finally we shall share] in the union which transcends the [created] intellect through the unknowable and blessed impulsions of [His] supra-luminary rays in a more divine imitation of the heavenly intellects because, as scripture says, «we shall be equals to the angels and sons of God, being sons of the Resurrection».[90]

Let me underline three things here: first, the explicit affirmation of three levels or aspects of the beatific vision: body, intellect (*nous*), and beyond the created frontiers of both the latter in union with the «supraluminary rays» of divinity. Second, we find the appeal to the Transfiguration's portrait of Christ's own transformed body.[91] The entire human composite is thus to be redeemed and transfigured, which affirmation, third, is quite in accord with what we have seen elsewhere, particularly in the *EH*.

This is not, however, the end of the passage which, up to this point, has been bracketed by a now (*nyn*) — then (*tote*) construction reminiscent of St. Paul in I Cor 13.12: «now in a glass darkly, but then face to face». Dionysius also admits the real, if fleeting and partial, possibility of a glimpse of eschatological realities in this life, and here he is again in complete accord with his ascetic sources. The *Liber Graduum* likewise insists on the possibility of vision «in this world» (*bhan alma*), as do the *Macarian Homilies* (*apo tou nyn*, «right now»), and Evagrius Ponticus.[92] «As for now» (*nyn de*), Dionysi-

[90] Ibid. 592BC (114:7–115:5). On this passage, see A. Golitzin, «On the Other Hand» // *SVTQ* 34.4 (1990) 305–323, esp. 310–316.

[91] On the huge importance of the Transfiguration in Eastern Christian thought, see J. McGuckin, The Transfiguration of Christ in Scripture and in Tradition (Lewistown—Queenstown, 1986) Esp. 99–143.

[92] For the *Liber*'s *bhan alma*, see *Mimra* 15.16, *PS* III, 373:12–13, and relatedly, «the migration» to the heavenly church «while still in this present life» in 12.2, 288:20–289:8; trans. in Brock, Syriac Fathers on Prayer... 46–47. For Macarius' *apo tou nyn*: see, e.g., Collection I, homilies 33.3.6 (Berthold II:31, line 14); 34.1 (II:34, lines 4–5); 50.2.3 (II:127, line 1); 54.4.6 (II:157, line 12); and 58.2.5 (II:184, line 25). In the last-named, note as well Macarius' insistence on the divine and objective nature of the light which appears — not a *noema*, a product of the intellect, but an *hypostatikon phos*, «substantial light» (II:183, lines 14–15). For Evagrius, see the

us thus continues, we use the analogies and symbols given us in the tradition, rise to the perception of the presence — the unity and simplicity, as he puts it — which informs them, and then cease the exercise of our own powers altogether in order to allow those of Another to take over, the «ray beyond being».[93] This is exactly the sequence he uses later in describing the ascent of Moses in the *MT*, and to which he also returns nearly a dozen times in the *DN*. The mysteriously impelling force which takes us over in this ascent is, as he spells out at length in *DN* 4,[94] nothing more nor less than God's own love, His *eros* or *agape*, which moved Him to create us and this world in the first place, and, in the second, to redeem His creatures in the Incarnation.

For anyone familiar with patristic literature dealing with the Trinity, particularly the thought of the great Cappadocian fathers of the fourth century, there are no surprises whatever in *DN* 2. It is straight Cappadocian triadology, together with, chiefly in its concluding section, a continuation and intensification of the essence/energy distinction which Basil the Great and Gregory of Nyssa had adumbrated over a century before Dionysius.[95] Bearing in mind, however, the links between between the *CD* and the ascetic tradition which I have sought to establish, I should also point out *DN* 2.8. The subject here is the relation of the Trinity to the process of deification, *theosis*, as the latter is realized in the uniquely intimate relationship obtaining between a «spiritual father» and his disciple, or «son». «Fatherhood and sonship of this kind», Dionysius writes, «are brought to perfection in a spiritual fashion... and this is the work of the divine Spirit».[96] He does not state that this relationship is uniquely monastic, which indeed it need not be, but there is equally no question that the mysterious bond between a Christian elder (*geron*) and his (or her!) disciple were highlighted in a new and peculiarly powerful way precisely in the literature of fourth century monasticism.[97] Dionysius

texts assembled and analyzed by G. Bunge, Nach dem Intellekt Leben? Zum sogenannten «Intellektualismus» der evagrianischen Spiritualität // Simandron, der Wachklopfer: Gedankenschrift für Klaus Gember / Ed. W. Nyssen (Köln, 1989) 95–109; together with N. Séd, La Shekinta et ses amis araméens // *COr* XX (1988) 230–242, esp. 240–242; and Golitzin, *Et introibo ad altare dei*... 335–338.

[93] *DN* 1.4, 592C–593A (115:6–18).

[94] *DN* 4.10–17, 705D–713D (154:7–162:5).

[95] See C. Pera, Denys le mystique et la *theomachia* // *RSR* 25 (1936) 5–75, esp. 36–49; Louth, Denys the Areopagite... 89–91; and Golitzin, *Et introibo ad altare dei*... 49–54 and 289–304.

[96] *DN* 2.8, 645BC (132:5–13).

[97] To scratch the surface of a large and growing bibliography: for a sensitive, if somewhat dated, analysis of the relationship between spiritual father and son in Eastern Christian ascetical literature, see I. Hausherr, Spiritual Direction in the Early Christian East / Trans. A. Gythiel (Kalamazoo, 1990) Esp. 1–98 and 123–151, together with K. T. Ware's «Forward», vii–xxxiii. See also H. J. M. Turner, St. Syme

sees in this relationship, further, an image — arguably for him even *the* image — of the Trinity itself, while adding, in a phrase we should remember when coming to the negations of *MT* 5, that, as with all other images, «the Father and the Son supremely transcend all divine fatherhood [*patrotes*] and sonship [*huiotes*]».[98] Let alone the physical begetting of sons, even this exalted image derived from a purely spiritual begetting is, in the last analysis, inadequate to its prototype in the divine life. I might add that I have never seen this passage connected with its obvious roots in Christian ascetical tradition in any of the scholarly literature, including — prior to this essay, at least — my own.

DN chapter 3 takes up yet another theme emphasized in ascetic literature, especially in Evagrius of Pontus: prayer.[99] It is prayer which constitutes the privileged path to divine encounter, the way *par excellence* through which we, in Dionysius' own terms, become present to God. Again, this phrasing and the marked emphasis he places on human passivity in the higher reaches of prayer places him, I think, squarely in the company of the earlier desert fathers in general and, once more, of Evagrius in particular. The passive note of the experience of God is specifically underlined earlier, in chapter 2, where Dionysius speaks of his spiritual father, Hierotheos (about whom we know nothing), «suffering» the mystery of the Incarnation, *pathon ta theia*.[100] Hierotheos appears again in chapter 3, where he is presented as having wholly departed himself, *exestekos*, and communed with the divine things on the

on the New Theologian and Spiritual Fatherhood (Leiden, 1990) Esp. 37–189. On the presence of the ascetic holy man in late antique society, see P. Brown, The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity // *JRS* 62 (1971) 80–101, and P. Rousseau, Ascetics, Authority, and the Church (Oxford, 1978) Esp. 18–67. On the holy man as «theophanic», see M. S. Burrows, On the Visibility of God in the Holy Man: A Reconsideration of the Role of the Apa in the Pachomian *Vitae* // *VC* 41 (1987) 11–33; S. A. Harvey, The Sense of a Stylite: Perspectives on Symeon the Elder // *VC* 42 (1988) 376–394; A. Orlov, A. Golitzin, «Many Lamps are Lightened from the One»: Paradigms of the Transformational Vision in the Macarian Homilies // *VC* 55 (2001) 281–298, esp. 292–298; and A. Golitzin, «Earthly Angels and Heavenly Men»: The OT Pseudepigrapha, Nicetas Stethatos, and the Tradition of «Interiorized Apocalyptic» in Eastern Christian Ascetical and Mystical Literature // *DOP* (forthcoming).

[98] *DN* 2.8, 645C (132:11–13).

[99] *DN* 3.1, 680B–D (138:2–139:16), and 680B (138:7–9) on «becoming present» to the Trinity. For Evagrius' *On Prayer*, see the translations of the Greek text in Nicodemus of the Holy Mountain's *Philokalia* 1:176–89 (under the name of Nilus of Sinai), and the slightly different MS tradition in *PG* 79. 1165–1199C, by, respectively, K. T. Ware, P. Sherrard, G. W. Palmer (eds.), The *Philokalia*: The Complete Text (London, 1979) 1:28–71; and J. E. Bamberger, The Praktikos and Chapters on Prayer (Kalamazoo, 1970) 52–80. Note the Evagrian «apophaticism» in *On Prayer* 67–68, 73–74, and 114–117.

[100] *DN* 2.9, 648B (134:2).

occasion of his participation in the funeral of the Mother of God — for which feast, by the way, Dionyius provides us with one of our earlier witnesses (it was very popular in Syria).[101] In the latter experience, of course, we find mystical ecstasy once again set in a liturgical context,[102] but I do not think that this takes away from the debt to ascetical literature. Hierotheos' «suffering» in the preceding chapter has no such ecclesiastical context.

VII. *The Mystical Theology*: Ascending the «Mountain of the Church» to Approach the Light of Christ, the *Shekinah*

These remarks brings us at last to the matter of the little treatise called *The Mystical Theology*, where I think we might do well to pause a moment to consider the meaning of that title, which is Dionysius' own coinage. We do well, too, to bear in mind the fact that the term, mysticism, as used today, is of relatively recent vintage, not much over 300 years old. Anyone approaching this little work in expectations of the sort of detailed, personal accounts of supra-normal experience which one meets in, say, the great Counter-Reformation mystics is going to be disappointed — as was Fr. Jean Vanneste forty years ago. Dionysius delivers nothing of the kind. Does this mean that he was not a «mystic», in our modern sense? It does not. I would myself say that he was writing about something he knew from experience, but I would have to add that this is an opinion which cannot be proven from the text. What is evident, though, and even obvious, is the fact that he believed that such an experience is possible.

This leads me back to the title. «Mystical» for our writer carries essentially its general, patristic meaning. It signifies «hidden», «secret», perhaps with overtones of «spiritual» — as in Origen of Alexandria's phrase, the «mystical sense» of scripture — and «invisible».[103] What then would a hidden, secret,

[101] *DN* 3.2, 681D–684A (141:11–14). For bibliography on the feast of the Mother of God's falling asleep, see S. A. Harvey, Incense Offerings in the Syriac *Transitus Mariae*: Ritual and Knowledge in Ancient Christianity // The Early Church in its Context: Essays in Honor of Everett Ferguson / Ed. A. J. Malherbe, F. W. Norris, J. W. Thornton (Leiden—Boston—Köln, 1998) 175–191.

[102] Cf. also Isaiah's vision in the Temple, the subject of all of *CH* 13, and Bishop Carpus' reception of visions prior to celebrating every liturgy, Epistle 8.6, 1097BC (188:11–13), together with Moses' ascent of Sinai in *MT* 1.3 as freighted with liturgical overtones. On the latter, see Rorem, Moses as the Paradigm of the Liturgical Spirituality of Pseudo-Dionysius…; and Golitzin, *Et introibo ad altare dei*... 168–177.

[103] See the sources and meanings listed for *mystikos* in G. W. H. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford, 1972) 893–894; together with B. McGinn, The Foundations of Christian Mysticism: Origins to the Fifth Century (New York, 1991) Esp. 117 ff.

spiritual or invisible *theology* be? As a glance at Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon* will tell us, our current understanding of the word, «theology», as «rational discourse about divine things» stands at the very bottom of a long list of meanings. By contrast, at the top of that list we find the following: 1) God, especially as in the inner life of the Trinity; 2) the experience of God in Trinity, i.e., the mystical (in the modern sense) encounter, also the beatific vision; 3) divine praise, liturgy, as in the worship of: a) the angels, and b) the Church; and 4) the Scripture.[104] It seems to me that this sequence, including its assignments of relative importance, gives us a pretty good idea of what Dionysius is up to. His subject, I take it, is the life of the Trinity as we may experience it in this life, recalling at the same time his stress on the liturgy and sacraments as supplying the whole context of our life in Christ, and his general attention to the scriptures. Only at the very end, last and least, do we have a technical, philosophically based discussion of the ascent to God, in this instance of the apophatic way or *via negativa*.

It is therefore no surprise that the *MT* is — again my favorite word — «bracketed» by the Trinity. Dionysius begins and ends with it. The *MT* opens with a prayer to the «supraessential Trinity», which I quote in slightly amended form from the Paulist Press translation:

> Lead us beyond unknowing and light, up to the furthest, highest peak of the mystical scriptures, where the mysteries of theology [recall our discussion just now!] lie simple, absolute, and unchanging in the brilliant darkness [*gnophos*] of a hidden silence. Amid the deepest shadows they pour out overwhelming light.[105]

Here we should note particularly the terms «silence» (*sige*) and darkness (*gnophos*). The latter, based on Exodus 19–20 and 24, will be the term of Moses' ascent two paragraphs later, while the former Dionysius understands as the terminus of all theological discourse, of all our words and images, as indicating that moment when we are, as it were, confonted with God Himself. I shall return to Moses and the darkness in a moment, but for now let me turn rather to the end of the treatise, where Dionysius moves to the application of the *via negativa* whose theory he has just finished sketching in chapters 2 and 3. He begins in chapter 4 by stating that God is not a body nor anything approachable by the senses (recall the Messalians' claim to a physical sight of the Trinity),[106] and then addresses the higher, intelligible names of God:

---

[104] Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon… 627–628.

[105] *MT* 1.1, 997A (141–142:3); Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works… 135.

[106] *MT* 4, 1040D (148). See above and nn. 52–3 for the Messalians. In view of the latter, and more broadly of the pseudepigraphic and apocryphal literature that I understand Dionysius to be confronting, I would see these negations directed against the notions of God having a body, a «place», a «form» (*morphe*) and «shape» (*eidos*),

> Moving yet higher, we say that He is... neither soul nor mind; neither has He imagination nor opinion nor reason [*logos*] nor intuitive knowing [*noesis*]; neither is He reason nor intuition, neither can He be reasoned nor intuited. He is neither life nor does He live; neither is He essence, nor eternity, nor time... He is neither oneness, nor deity, nor goodness. He is not spirit, as we understand [the term], nor sonship nor fatherhood... He is no one of the things which are not, nor any one of those which are... beyond affirmation... and beyond negation is the transcendence of Him Who, simply, is beyond all things and free.[107]

It may be argued that I have been a little perverse here in choosing to use as pronoun the masculine singular, «He», and in assigning the place of the last word to «free», *apolelymenon*, when the Greek actually ends with «beyond [*epekeina*] them all». Both moves are frankly interpretative, that is, intended to emphasize what I take to be Dionysius' central concerns. On the other hand, to use the pronoun «it», as the Paulist Press text does, is itself equally an interpretation, and one which, given the English associations with the neuter pronoun, is inevitably a negative one.[108] In light of my prior discussion, I think it fair to say that we can dispense with the question mark over Dionysius' Christianity, and thus use «He» both to underline the personal quality of the encounter with God, and, with an eye toward my discussion of the epistles following the *MT*, to point toward Christ. Likewise, I understand «free» to signal the real thrust of these negations. Their point is that God is subject to absolutely none of our conceptions. Even the revealed names — Father, Son, and Spirit — are finally icons, images, drawn from human experience in the world. They are, indeed, *given* us in order to point to a reality in the Godhead, in fact to a divine *community*, but that community in and for itself escapes definitition altogether. Note, too, Dionysius' careful qualification: «not spirit *as we understand [the term]*», and recall as well that we have

---

etc., as quite relevant to Dionysius' readers. These were ancient ideas, based on the biblical throne visions, and, in both Jewish and Christian circles, long-lived. On their presence in Jewish literature roughly contemporary to Dionysius, see for example G. Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition (New York, 1960) 36–42; and in early Christian literature, G. G. Stroumsa, Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ // *HTR* 76.3 (1983) 269–288; together with DeConick, Seek to See Him… Esp. 95–125, and Fossum, Partes Posteriori Dei…

[107] *MT* 5, 1045D–1048B (149–150).

[108] Note that, although the negations begin in *MT* 4 and carry on through most of 5 speaking of «the cause of all», *he ton panton aitia*, admittedly an impersonal phrase and with attendant pronouns in the feminine (for *aitia*), they conclude with: «the transcendence of *him* [or «it»] who, simply, is beyond all things and free» (*he hyperoche tou panton haplos apolelymenou kai epekeina ton holon*), where *tou* and *apolelymenou* indicate either a masculine or a neuter genitive singular. I have opted for the former.

already seen him denying the adequacy of sonship and fatherhood to God in *DN* 2.8 while discussing «spiritual fatherhood». Again, even the most exalted and refined of our relations with one another are only pointers to a reality which transcends us. They are, surely, «like» God in some sense, but the divine reality is not simply equivalent to our experiences with each other. God can only be known in the experience of His presence, His light, His darkness — in short, in the special kind of «unknowing» which we also saw begin the *DN*.

All this brings me, at long last, to the ascent of Moses in *MT* 1.3, which I quote at length in my own translation:

> Moses is bidden first of all to be purified himself, and then to separate himself... and, after complete purification, he hears the many-voiced trumpets, he beholds many lights... then... with the chosen priests he arrives at the summit of the divine ascents. And yet in these he still meets not with God, for he sees not Him — since He is not to be seen — but the place [*topos*] where He stands. And this I take to mean the highest and most divine of the things which are seen and grasped by intuitive knowing, which are certain basic principles [*logoi*] of the things subordinate to Him Who transcends all things, through which His Presence [*parousia*] is indicated which is above any conception, and which is mounted upon the spiritual summits of His most holy places. And then, abandoning both what is seen and those who see them, he enters into the truly secret darkness [*gnophos*] of unknowing, according to which he closes [his eyes] to all perceptions open to knowledge, and enters into Him Who is altogether untouchable and invisible and beyond all things. Beyond all things, and belonging to nothing else, whether to himself or to any other, he is, in accordance with what is greater and by a complete cessation of all his own activity of knowing, united to Him Who is wholly unknowable, and by knowing nothing, knows in a manner beyond intellect.[109]

It is difficult for me to say that this is not a properly «mystical» text, whether of Dionysius' own experience or else taken from the experience of others, such as Evagrius, who uses Ex. 24.10 in a very similar way.[110] Nothing known is God. The notional iconography of the divine names carries us up to «the place where God stands» (so Ex. 24.10 in the LXX), which I understand to mean, on the basis of the Exodus text and its interpretation, to just beneath the divine throne. The one phrase which has given pause to some is the «in accordance with what is greater», *kata to kreitton*. By this «greater» some-

[109] *MT* 1.3, 1000C–1001A (143:18–144:15).

[110] For Evagrius' use of Ex 24:10, see esp. the sixty chapters supplementary to his *Kephalaia Gnostica* edited by W. Frankenberg, Evagrius Ponticus (Berlin, 1912), particularly chps. 2, 21, and 25 (p. 425, 441, and 449), together with letters 29, 33, and esp. 39 (p. 587, 589, and 593).

thing, Moses is joined to the unknowable God, and with all his own, human activities of mind at a standstill, quiescent. Is this «greater» an inherent faculty? It might be, equivalent in fact to the term, *henosis* or union, which Dionysius uses elsewhere and seems to understand as the human capacity for receiving God.[111] If so, however, it is a wholly passive capacity, once more reminiscent of Evagrius Ponticus and the «susceptibility» which the latter sees as the highest faculty of the created intellect, the *nous*, i.e., that whereby the intellect may become a vessel ready to receive the «light of the Trinity». It is that in us which answers, again in Evagrius as in Dionysius, to the Church's altar.[112] The last act of the human approach to God is thus an openness, a surrender, in order to enter into the Presence, the *parousia* in Dionysius' terms, or, as I like to think of it, into the darkness which is at the same time the «unapproachable light» of the *Shekinah*.

I shall make my reasons for referring to light, and even to the *Shekinah*, clear in a moment, I hope. For now, let me also recall the discussion above on the liturgy in, particularly, *CH* 1.3 and *EH* 4.3.12. The liturgical tonality of Moses' ascent, in both the biblical texts themselves and in Dionysius, is or should be obvious. Moses, as Professor Rorem has pointed out, is certainly a type of the dionysian hierarch, of the bishop standing before the altar,[113] but he is also a type of the Christian soul. The *ascensus montis dei* is at the same an *ingressus ad altare dei*, a movement into the living core of the Christian mystery: to Christ in heaven, on the altar, and within the heart. Taken by itself, as it has too often been taken, this passage in tandem with the «nots» of *MT* 5 might well suggest, as again Professor Rorem thinks is the case, a «loveless» and «christless» mysticism.[114] And, in fact, the words «Christ», «Jesus», and «love» do not occur at all in the *MT*, so how can I maintain their presence, even if unspoken? I reply that I can, first, because we have already seen in the *CH* and, especially, in the *EH* that Christ, in the Church, is our divine milieu. He is the one in Whom we receive the «eyes of the intellect»

[111] Vanneste, Mystère de Dieu... 183–217; and Y. de Andia, Henôsis: l'union à Dieu chez Denys l'Aréopagite...

[112] «The intelligible temple is the pure intellect which now possesses in itself the Wisdom of God... the temple of God is he who is a beholder of the sacred unity, and the altar of God is the contemplation of the Holy Trinity» (*Kephalaia Gnostica* V.84 / Ed. A. Guillaumont in *PO* 28, p. 213. Cf. also supplementary chapters 37 and 45 (Frankenberg, Evagrius Ponticus… 459 and 461).

[113] «Moses as the Paradigm of the Liturgical Spirituality of Pseudo-Dionysius», *SP* 18.2 (1989) 275–279. The bishop as Moses, with echoes of Dionysius' *MT* 1.3, is taken up with delight by Patriarch Germanos of Constantinople in the early eighth century. See St. Germanos on the Divine Liturgy / Tr. P. Meyendorff (Crestwood, NY, 1990) 90–93.

[114] Expressed perhaps most forcefully in his The Uplifting Spirituality of Pseudo-Dionysius… 144.

and, in Whom, as «our most divine altar», «wholly consumed», we discover our access to God. Second, because that same consummation, on the peak of the «Mountain of the Church», must surely discover its correlate experience here, in the darkness of the mount of revelation and theophany, Sinai, a correlation that we have already met in Ephrem Syrus: the Church as Sinai. Third, Christ is also Himself the *myron* that consecrates and consumes, the substance of the gift received through the very access which He Himself offers us. Fourth, regarding love, Dionysius has already told us in the *DN*, and at length, that divine *eros* is the power which returns us all to God. It is thus necessarily that force which drives the *ascensus-ingressus* of Moses here in the *MT*.

VIII. Completing the Context of the *Mystical Theology*: *Epistles* I–V and Christ the «Sudden»

I suggest that the first five epistles of the *CD* function as a kind of chiasm, and that together they serve to round out and complete the thought of the *MT*.[115] Let me proceed according to what I take to be the chiasm, with Epistle 1 matching up with 5, Epistle 2 with 4, and Epistle 3 tying them up and together. Epistle I continues the themes of divine darkness and unknowing which preoccupy the *MT*: God's transcendent darkness (here *skotos*) is «hidden by the light of knowledge», Dionysius says, while «complete unknowing is the knowledge of Him Who is known to transcend all things».[116] Very good, but then this is met and countered by the opening of Epistle V: «The divine darkness [*gnophos*] *is* the unapproachable light in which God is said to dwell».[117] God's dwelling place, *katoiketerion*, recalls — and not, I think, accidentally — the place of the divine throne which, in the ancient traditions of apocalyptic literature, and in the later Christian apocalypses and apocryphal materials which I mentioned above in connection with the monks (or, for that matter, in the Rabbinic mystical texts of the *merkabah*, the divine chariot-throne), is always characterized by overwhelming light. Light is both the Presence, the *Shekinah* Himself, and the stream which proceeds from Him[118] Thus we find Dionysius continuing in Epistle V:

[115] I have made this argument before, in *Et introibo ad altare dei*... 222–227 and, with larger range of supporting texts, in Revisiting the 'Sudden': Epistle III in the *Corpus Dionysiacum* // *SP* 37 (2001) 482–491.

[116] Epistle 1, 1065A (156–157).

[117] Epistle 5, 1073A (162:3–4), and cf. *DN* 7.2, 869A (196:11–12) for the same equation of the *gnophos* of Sinai with the *aprositon phos*, «unapproachable light», of I Tim 6:16.

[118] For the fire and/or light of the Presence in the ancient apocalypses, see *I Enoch* 14:17–22 and 71:2–6; Daniel 7:10; *2 Enoch* 20:1 and 22:1; *3 Enoch* 36, among Jewish sources, and cf. the Christian *Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah* 8:1–2, 21–26;

> And if it [i.e., the unapproachable light] is invisible because of its superabundant clarity, and unapproachable because of its transcendent outpouring of light, yet is here that everyone who enters [*gignetai*] who has been made worthy of seeing and knowing God.[119]

He then goes on to cite David and, especially, Paul as examples of this experience. Let me draw our attention to two other points here. First, the «entering into» the divine presence deploys the same verb (*gignomai*) as Dionysius uses in Epistle X concerning those holy ascetics who, even in this life, «are already with God» (*meta tou Theou gignomenous*). Second, an ancient marginal note to Epistle V here will help us in identifying a key theophany to which I believe Dionysius will shortly be alluding in the central Epistle III. On the phrase, «unapproachable light», the scholiast makes the seemingly humdrum observation that the experience of the *visio dei* might be compared to trying to stare at the sun's disk at noon (*mesembria*).[120]

The «transcendent outpouring of light» leads us to the matter of God's self-communication, which I take to be the subject of both Epistles II and IV. In the former, Dionysius alludes back to a distinction that he had touched on in *DN* 2 and 11, between God *in se* and *ad extra*. God truly gives Himself, the Areopagite states in Epistle II, and truly deifies, but, while He is Himself the deifying gift, *theopoion doron*, He yet transcends all the relations He enters into. He gives of His actions (*energeiai*) or powers (*dynameis*), but not of His essence (*ousia*).[121] Epistle IV makes it clear that the source of this gift of divine energy or power is Christ. In Jesus, Dionysius tells us, transcendence and immanence (here *apophasis* and *kataphasis*, respectively) have met and been joined. Those things, he goes on, «which are affirmed of Jesus' love for humanity preserve the force of transcendent negation». Therefore, he concludes,

---

and 9:6. On the Rabbis, see again Chernus, Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism… 74–87, and for personal transformation, W. F. Smelik, On the Mystical Transformation of the Righteous into Light in Judaism // *JSJ* 27.2 (1995) 122–144; and in the early Christian *Gospel of Thomas*, see again (as above, n. 51) A. DeConick, Seek to See Him… For the «blessed light of the Holy Trinity» in Evagrius, see A. Guillaumont, Les visions mystiques dans le monachisme oriental chrétien // Aux origines du monachisme… 136–147; Séd, La Shekinata et ses amis araméens… 240–242; Bunge, Nach dem Intellekt Leben?…, and for the same notes in Evagrius' teacher, Gregory of Nazianzus, J. A. McGuckin, Perceiving Light from Light in Light (Oration 31.3): The Trinitarian Theology of Gregory the Theologian // *GOTR* 39.1 (1994) 7–32.

[119] Epistle 5, 1073A (162:4–6).

[120] *PG* 4. 536B.

[121] See *DN* 11.6, 953C–956B (222:3–223:3), and also 5.2, 816C (181:7–15), together with John of Scythopolis' *scholion* on Epistle II in *PG* 4. 529B–D, where John rightly discerns the importance of Dionysius' distinction between the powers/activities which God shares with us, and the incommunicable essence, for understanding the Areopagite's «deifying gift» in Epistle II.

> [Christ] did not do what is divine as God, nor what is human as man, but instead [as] God having become man, He has administered to [or, arranged for] us a certain, new divine-human activity.[122]

My translation is different from the usual rendering of this text, which applies the «theandric activity» entirely to Jesus, as in the Paulist Press version: «He accomplished something new in our midst — the activity of the God-man». Whether strictly accurate or not, however, it still serves to convey something which Dionysius believes is true and fundamental, and that is that the Incarnation affords us a real participation in God's own actions and gifts. Let us recall the definition of hierarchy, which I quoted earlier from *CH* 3.1–2, and which included the description of a hierarchy's members as «spotless mirrors of the primordial light». We might add, in *EH* 1, the reference to Jesus Who «makes our life, disposition, and activity [*energeia*] something divine».[123] I could multiply examples, but these will suffice to make my point: Christ's divine-human activity comes even to us, and it does so specifically in the divine polity and way of life — the *entheos politeia*, as Dionysius puts it elsewhere[124] — of the Church. It is in the latter that we receive the «deifying gift» mentioned in Epistle II, just as it is in and through the Church that we are led to encounter the mystery of Christ's divinity in a «transcendent outpouring of light».

These several points, together indeed with the entire *CD* itself, are summed up by the center and «punchline» of the chiasm, Epistle III, which I translate in full:

> «Suddenly» means that which comes forth from the hitherto invisble and beyond hope into manifestation. And I think that here the scripture [lit., theology] is suggesting the philanthropy of Christ. The super-essential has proceeded out of its hiddenness to become manifest to us by becoming a human being. But He is also hidden, both after the manifestation and, to speak more divinely, even within it. For this is the hidden of Jesus, and neither by rational discourse nor by intuition can His mystery [*mysterion*] be explained. but instead, even when spoken it remains ineffable, and when conceived with the intellect, unknowable [*agnoston*].[125]

The first thing we notice is the reprise of the themes we have been discussing: divine unknowability and ineffability, together with the tension between transcendent hiddenness and revelation. Secondly, there is the sacramental echo in the reference to the *mysterion* of the Incarnation. Christ is *the* sacrament,

---

[122] Epistle 4, 1072BC (161:4–10).

[123] *EH* 1.1, 372AB (63:12–64:6).

[124] For *entheos politeia*, see *EH* 2.2.4, 396A (71:5); 3.3.11, 441C (91:23); and Epistle 9, 1113A (206:2).

[125] Epistle 3, 1069B (159:3–10).

both at the center and terminus of the divine processions to us and to our world, and, simultaneously, the vehicle and goal of our return, or ascent.

The real force and key to the coalescence of Dionysius' thought here lies in the word, «suddenly» (*exaiphnes*), which opens the epistle. On the one hand, and as has often been noted by modern scholarship, the «sudden» has a long ancestry in the Platonic tradition. Plato himself uses it three times: in the *Parmenides* to indicate the timeless moment of intersection between the eternal, unmoving realm of the Forms and the world of serial time and flux; again in the *Symposium*, to signify the end and goal of the ascent of *eros* to the vision of Beauty; and lastly, in Ep VII of Plato's corpus, for the «sudden» conclusion of the philosopher's quest in, perhaps, the vision of divinity (a passage which is alluded to, in fact, in *CH* 15). All these — eros, beauty, stasis/motion, eternity/time — are also important Dionysian themes. Plotinus, too, in an even closer approximation to the thought of the *CD*, uses the «sudden» in *Enneads* V.3.17; 5.7; and VI.7.36 to signal the vision of the One in light. I have no doubt that Dionysius was aware of these passages.[126]

It is at this point, however, that modern scholarship has always stopped. It thus remains entirely insensitive to the resonances which the «sudden» has in the scriptures and in later Christian literature, all of which I believe Dionysius also intended to evoke. I have in mind especially four appearances in the NT of the word, *exaiphnes*, together with certain passages in early ascetical literature and, again, St. Ephrem Syrus. The NT texts are Acts 9.3, 22.6, Lk 2.13, and Mk 13.36. The first two are both descriptions of St. Paul's conversion on the Damascus Road and are functionally identical. I quote from the second: «And it happened that as I was travelling... at around midday [*mesembria*] a great light from heaven flashed suddenly around me». The light, of course, is Christ, Who sends Paul on to his life's work, the apostolate to the gentiles. I note the themes of light, personal encounter with Christ, the «midday» we saw above signaled by the anonymous scholiast, and, perhaps not least, the mission to the «Greeks».[127] Luke 2.13 links the «sudden» to the angelic liturgy, the *gloria in excelsis*, which appears around the shepherds near Bethlehem at the moment of the Incarnation. The fourth text, Mk 13.36,

[126] For discussion of the Platonist background of the «sudden» in Epistle 3, see W. Beierwaltes, *Exaiphnes*, oder die Paradoxie des Augenblicks // *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 84 (1966/67) 271–282; and R. Mortley, From Word to Silence. Vol. II: The Way of Negation (Bonn, 1986) 236–240.

[127] I have encountered the *mesembria*, «noonday», elsewhere in the ascetical literature in contexts which have overtones of the mystical vision. See, for example, Basil the Great, *Longer Rules* 2 (*PG* 31. 909); and Evagrius, Epistle 33 (Frankenberg, Evagrius Ponticus… 589). I seem to recall a similar use of the word in Gregory of Nyssa, but the precise reference escapes me just now. The scholiast's remark in any case appears to have been rooted in a tradition, perhaps even one based on the story of St. Paul's vision on the road to Damascus.

occurs at the end of that gospel's eschatological discourse. Be watchful, Christ warns His listeners, lest returning «suddenly», the Master find them sleeping. The NT therefore ties the «sudden» to Christ, light, the angelic liturgy, ascetical «watchfulness», and the eschaton. Surely, this set of associations is at least as important for Dionysius as the ones I listed above from the pagans.

The appearances of the «sudden» which follow from the later Christian literature are not the result of any thorough inquiry on my part. I have made no systematic search, yet each of the following works: the *Acts of Judas Thomas* (popular in the Syrian Church at least into the sixth century), Athanasius' *Life of Anthony*, and the works of St Ephrem are all texts with which Dionysius could easily have been familiar. In the third century *Acts of Thomas*, the «sudden» occurs at the climactic point of the «Hymn of the Pearl», when the speaker encounters the «robe of glory» woven for him in heaven:

> But suddenly (Gr. *exaiphnes*, Syr. *men shel'*), when I saw it over against me, the splendid robe became like me, as my reflection in a mirror... so that we were two in distinction, and again one in a single form... And the likeness of the King of Kings was completely embroidered all over it... I clothed myself with it, and mounted up to the gate of greeting... I bowed my head and worshipped the splendor of the Father [meaning Christ here] Who had sent the robe to me.[128]

The robe here is the «heavenly double» and «luminous image», familiar from both Jewish and Christian literature, in which the speaker recognizes the form or shape of his own true being. Christ as the «Splendor» (*pheggos*) of the Father again recalls the Glory and *Shekinah* traditions, just as the scene itself partakes of the classical patterns of the ascent to heaven in apocalyptic literature.[129] In the *Life of Anthony*, the «sudden» occurs early in the narrative, after «the father of monks» has grown weary and battered from his struggles with the demons. Near despair, Anthony cries to God for help and, «suddenly», the roof of the tomb where he is staying opens up and a beam of light descends to surround him. The light is the presence of Christ, Who expells the demons and comforts His champion.[130]

---

[128] *Acta Thomae* 112 // Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha / Ed. M. Bonnet (Hildesheim, 1959) II.2, 223:7–13; translation in W. Schneemelcher (ed.), New Testament Apocrypha / Trans. R. McL. Wilson (Louisville, 1992) 2:384–385.

[129] For a similar use of the «sudden» (*exaiphnes*), see the *Acta Phillipi* // Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha... II.2, 10:26–11:5 (Christ appears «suddenly», more radiant than the sun); and in an early Manichean document, The Cologne Mani Codex: «Concerning the Origin of His Body» / Ed. R. Cameron, A. J. Davey (Missoula, 1979) 55:12–57:16, pp. 42 and 44 (a «sudden» rapture to heaven). On the latter text as indicative of continuing traditions of apocalyptic asccent in Syro-Mesopotamian Christian and para-Christian circles, see J. C. Reeves, Heralds of that Good Realm: Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions (Leiden, 1996) 5–30.

[130] *Vita Antonii* 10; *PG* 26. 860A.

St. Ephrem mentions the «sudden» three times to my knowledge, once in his *Hymns on Nature* and twice in the *Paradise Hymns*, to which I have already referred several times. In the first, it is Christ Who is the «star of light Who shone forth suddenly» in the Incarnation.[131] In the *Paradise Hymns* the «sudden» occurs first in reference to the angelic liturgy. The *trisagion* of the Seraphim «suddenly» breaks the silence before the Presence in Eden, and, interestingly enough in light of our discussion of Sinai, Ephrem brings up the angelic worship here in parallel to a reference to the thunder of theophany on Sinai.[132] The second appearance of the «sudden» in the *Paradise Hymns*, and perhaps the most apposite of all considering our reflections on Dionysius so far, occurs during Ephrem's obviously eucharistic allusion to the supper of the risen Jesus with the two disciples at Emmaus in Luke 24:29–31:

> When the disciples eyes were closed, bread too was the key whereby their eyes were opened to recognize the Omniscient One: darkened eyes beheld a vision of joy and were suddenly filled with happiness.[133]

It seems to me, just on the basis of these nine texts, that we have evidence of a certain tradition or at least current in Christian literature which links the «sudden» to Christ, to light, and to both the heavenly and earthly liturgies.[134] Assuming that Dionysius knew Syriac, there is perhaps an additional play on this word. The Syriac phrase which renders the Greek *exaiphnes* is *men shelya*. *Men* is simply the preposition «from», like the Greek *ek*. *Shelya*, on the other hand, has interesting associations. It contains the meanings: «rest», «silence», and «stillness», and is usually connected in Christian Syriac with the hermits,

---

[131] Ephrem Syrus, *de natura* 6.7, *CSCO* 186, 52; ET: K. McVey, Ephrem the Syrian: Hymns (New York, 1989) 112.

[132] *Hymnen de Paradiso* 5.11, *CSCO* 174, 18:6–11 (*men shel* on line 7); Brock, Hymns on Paradise… 106.

[133] Ibid. 15.4, 63:3–8 (*men shel* on line 8); Brock, Hymns on Paradise… 183. I was alerted to the importance of the «sudden» in Ephrem by M. Schmidt, Alttestamentliche Typologien in Paradies Hymnen von Ephräm der Syrer // Paradeigmata: Literarische Typologie des alten Testaments / Ed. F. Link (Berlin, 1989) 55–81, here 75, together with the explicit parallels she draws between Ephrem and Dionysius in 64–55.

[134] M. N. A Bochmuehl, Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity (Tübingen, 1990) notes, p. 66, that «the theme of heavenly revelation out of silence is common in ancient Jewish thought», citing in particular the *Wisdom of Solomon* 18:14–15, which is worth quoting here: «For while gentle silence [*hesychou siges*] enveloped all things...your all-powerful word [*logos*] leaped from heaven, from the royal throne, into the midst of the land...» (NRSV). Note the movement of the divine word from the throne, and from silence, into the world. In anticipation of my remarks on the Syriac for «suddenly» below, note as well that the Syriac Old Testament, the *Peshitta*, has thus the word (*melta*) moving «from... silence» [*men... shelya*].

as is *hesychia* in Christian Greek.[135] It may also, though, be used, as Dionysius' precise contemporary, the distinguished scholar and bishop, Philoxenus of Mabbug, uses it, to signify the divine being or essence.[136] As a bilingual pun playing off of these several resonances — thus: «from silence», «from stillness», «from the divine being», etc. — the «sudden» fits indeed very well into the intentions and associations of the *CD*, and particularly of the *MT*, which I have been at pains to underline so far.[137]

Here I am reminded of yet another Syrian whose works we know Dionysius knew, Ignatius of Antioch. The latter characterized Christ as the Word Who proceeds from the Father's silence, *sige*. Ignatius elsewhere offers a remark that, again, echoes some of the themes we touched on in the *MT* and in the epistles: «It is better to keep silence and to be, than to talk and not to be... He that truly possesses the word of Jesus is able to listen to His silence».[138] I would therefore suggest that the silence which concludes the *MT* is neither empty nor impersonal, but instead the presence of the light of Christ.

But I have not yet cited the scriptural text which the *scholia* of John of Scythopolis tell us Dionysius is actually quoting in Epistle III. This is Malachi 3.1: «And suddenly the Lord Whom you seek will come into His temple, and the Angel of great counsel whom you desire».[139] The incarnational allusion that John sees in this text is doubtless part of Dionysius' intention, but, given the other resonances of «temple» which we have seen in the course of this essay, the continual coördination between the temple of the liturgical assembly and the temple of the Christian's body and soul, together with the resonances of mystical experience and especially of a theophany of light attached to the word, «sudden», we can surely say that Dionysius intends to signify as well the presence of Christ on the eucharistic altar, His body after

[135] See J. Payne Smith, A Compendius Syriac Dictionary (Oxford, 1903, repr. 1990) 580.

[136] See R. Chestnut, Three Monophysite Christologies (Oxford, 1976) 63, n. 2, and 105 for *shelya* in Philoxenus of Mabbug. In her first example, it denotes the simplicity of the divine essence, and in her second signals the inner condition of the soul — quiet, silence — necessary for the encounter with God.

[137] Thus «from the simple divine being» and the «stillness» around the divine throne (cf. the discussion above, n. 134, of Wisdom 18:14–15), hence a reference to the Incarnation, and «from the silence *within*», and so the mystical perception of the divine Presence.

[138] Ignatius, *Magnesians* 8 and *Ephesians* 15. For the Greek text, see the edition by P. Camelot, Lettres. Martyr de Polycarpe (Paris, 1969) (SC, 10) 86 and 70–72, respectively.

[139] *PG* 4. 532AB. In fact, the text John cites appears to be conflation of Mal. 3:1 and Isa 9:6 (LXX). The second half of Mal. 3:1 actually reads «and the Angel of the Covenant», unless there is a variant version of which I am unaware. John's version, of course, accentuates the echo of the Incarnation.

all, together with His visitation — «beyond hope», «ineffable», «unknowable», to cite Epistle III — within the temple of the soul. This, the sudden flash of the «unapproachable light» within, is, I submit, the very content of the *gnophos* into which Moses ascends in *MT* 1.3, as well as of the «consummation» and «access» of *EH* 4.3.12, where Christ is both the way and the goal. Epistle III is the *Corpus dionysiacum* in concentrated form: christological, liturgical, and mystical. The worship of the heavenly and earthly churches, the experience of the transcendent God, the hope of the Christian, all meet on the altar which is Christ.

IX. A Reply to the Critics: The Revealed «Pattern» of Public Worship and Private Prayer

The first question mark over my title still stands. The other two do not. My Dionysius is both Christian and mystic, or, regarding the last, is at the very least a theologian who places the mystical encounter at the center of his thought. But, it is fair to ask, is «my» Dionysius the real one? Here I can do no more than suggest, speaking in terms of the historical «sciences» which we have all been obliged to learn from the Germans — *wissenschaftlicherweise*, as it were — that the hypothesis which offers the best, most rounded and elegant account of the phenomenon under investigation ought to be preferred. I think that my accounting here best matches that description. My Dionysius belongs and contributes to a continuum. On the one hand, we have the long tradition of Christian Platonism, beginning as early as, say, the Epistle to the Hebrews and continuing through Christian Alexandria to the Asia Minor of the Cappadocians, and then going on through Dionysius to Maximus Confessor, John Damascene, and, still further, to the end of the Byzantine era.[140] Similarly, the ascetico-mystical line begins at or in the setting of Second Temple Judaism, even before Christian origins, carries on in the second and third century texts of, for example, the Thomas tradition, sees its encratism and centrifugal tendencies corrected by other, primarily Syrian ascetics in the fourth century (thus Aphrahat, the *Liber*, Macarius, and Ephrem), and then runs, again, through Dionysius to Maximus, especially to the latter's profound little treatise, *The Mystagogy*, which sets out — precisely as Maximus says he is going to do — in explicit fashion nearly all the very same same connections which I have been obliged to tease out of the *CD*,[141] and

[140] On the Christian Platonist tradition in the East, if from a Roman Catholic perspective and hence not always especially friendly to certain aspects of Eastern tradition, see the still very useful study by E. von Ivanka, Plato Christianus (Einsiedeln, 1964), together with Golitzin, *Et introibo ad altare dei*... 255–317.

[141] For an account of Maximus' *Mystagogy* which appears — and quite strikingly so, since it is to the best of my knowledge a wholly independent work — as a near

then, beyond Maximus, to Symeon New Theologian and Nicetas Stethatos in the eleventh century, and on to Gregory of Sinai and Nicholas Cabasilas in the fourteenth.[142] Dionysius fits exactly into these two continua. He is «bracketed», to use that word one last time, by tradition on all sides. It was for this reason, far more than for any aura which may have attached to his sub-apostolic pseudonym, that he was accepted so quickly and so wholeheartedly in the East, and especially so by the monks. Put another way, they welcomed in him what they had known already and accepted in others before him. They recognized him for what he was, a spokesman of the Great Tradition. Put more simply still, and, I confess, with a certain measure of glee in the face of all those fuming Germans, the monks have always known better.

I doubt, however, that «my» Dionysius will necessarily convince many of the scholars whose views I covered — very lightly, to be sure — earlier in this essay. Dionysius as an anomaly, a sort of «lonely meteorite» blazing oddly across the night sky of patristic thought, to use an image coined by Fr. Jean Vanneste, is too embedded in the scholarly consensus — to the degree that we can speak of any consensus at all — to be rooted out easily.[143] Yet the very fact that Dionysius was accepted by contemporaries of the highest stature and intellectual attainment — Severus of Antioch, John of Scythopolis, and the Alexandrian Christian philosopher, John Philoponus, in the sixth century, Maximus Confessor in the seventh, and John Damascene in the eighth, to name but a few of the most prominent — suggests at the least that he was not so odd to them as he seems nowadays to us. To hold in any case that men of the degree of intelligence, learning, and spiritual accomplishment as those whom I have just listed were simply gulled by the pseudonym is frankly ludicrous. They had to have seen something they liked and, to repeat myself, which they recognized. Long-standing scholarly shibboleths have also played their part in modern dismissals of the Areopagite. Here I think especially of

---

exact duplicate of my reading of Dionysius, particularly on the relation between the *EH* and *MT*, see A. Louth, Wisdom of the Byzantine Church: Evagrios of Pontos and Maximus the Confessor. 1997 Paine Lectures in Religion (University of Missouri-Colombia, 1998) Esp. «Apophatic Theology and the Liturgy in St. Maximos the Confessor» 34–45.

[142] See in regard to this chain esp. A. Golitzin, Hierarchy versus Anarchy? Dionysius Areopagita, Symeon the New Theologian, Nicetas Stethatos, and their Common Roots in Ascetical Tradition // *SVTQ* 39.3 (1994) 131–179; together with the brief sketch of the Dionysian reception in Golitzin, *Et introibo ad altare dei*... 401–413. On the «inner liturgy» in the Byzantine Hesychast, Gregory of Sinai, see M. van Parys, La liturgie du coeur selon saint Grégoire le Sinaïte // *Irénikon* 51.3 (1978) 312–337, though the author, while citing Maximus' liturgy of the heart (cf. above, n. 141), seems quite unaware of the presence of his theme in the fourth-century Syrians, in Dionysius, and in Symeon and Nicetas.

[143] Vanneste, Is the Mysticism of Pseudo-Dionysius Genuine?... 288–289.

the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century argument for a «Hellenization» of the Gospel put forward with such force by such scholars as Adolph von Harnack, a thesis which still on occasion, and to no good effect, intrudes into and obfuscates the study of the Early Church. Confessional attitudes have also played a role in the assessment of Dionysius, whether explicitly (Nygren) or implicitly (Rorem), and have in their turn as often obscured the picture as they have illumined it. Put crudely, Dionysius, according to this particular confessional approach, amounts to a kind of justification for the Reformation. More broadly, however, the Dionysian «problem» is itself but one particular instance of a generally prevailing — even today — «occidentalism» in patristic (and, in so far as it retains any theological interests whatever, modern biblical) scholarship, which is to say that Dionysius continues to be read through the lense of the great Western tradition which owes so profoundly to Augustine of Hippo. It is the latter who contributed essentially to that larger *Gestalt* of Western theology which I touched on in my introduction, a *Gestalt* which remained fundamentally unaltered in its basic outline even in a setting, such as that of the medieval Schoolmen, where the Areopagite could be heartily welcomed. The result, as I also noted at the beginning of this essay, was a kind of kaleidoscopic splintering and fragmentation of the *Corpus dionysiacum* into different elements, one or another of which might then be incorporated into the extant form and concerns of Western theology. One had only to rotate the tube, as it were, to find a pattern that would please.

In spite of how my last remarks may appear, I really do not wish to indulge here either in a cheap bout of Augustine-bashing (especially since I have come more and more over the years to appreciate him as one of the great Fathers), or in yet another instance — to borrow from the idiom of Newtonian physics — of an equal and opposing «orientalism». Either or both would be quite as limited and provincial as what I am criticizing here. Indeed, and too typical of much Orthodox literature, this would simply be to engage in a theology of reaction, defensive in mode, condemnatory in tone, no whit better than the sort of polemic, conscious or unconscious, that I am deploring, and in the last analysis little more than a kind of mirror-image opposite of its target. Understandable as such an attitude might be in light of the massive weight — indeed, all-prevailing dominance — of western thought throughout the world, it a remains a futile and sterile self-indulgence. The problem is not with bad will, as it were, on the part of past Dionysian exegetes, including as far back as the Scholastics themselves, but rather that the lense through which they read Christianity itself has been shaped by the Augustinian inheritance. What fits that lense, perhaps especially as it was refined by the Reformers — e.g., the great dichotomies of law and gospel, nature and grace, and the overarching principle of justification by faith — does not really fit Dionysius or, indeed, much of the Christian East, and thus what I do want to do, and what I hope I have at least begun to do, is to enter the plea that we look — really

look — at a strange (to us) body of theological literature and try to see it anew, to place it in the context for which I believe it was intended. If we do that, and if we make use, exactly, of those same splendid tools which Western scholarship makes available to us (and for which I daily give thanks), then I think we will begin to perceive the lineaments of a Christian accounting of the liturgy, of ascetical striving, of mystical vision, and — above and before all else — of Christ, which, for all the oddity of its rococo vocabulary, should strike us as at once powerful, deeply moving, and — even — strangely familiar.

That familiar element, to put things in a nutshell, derives most basically from the OT traditions of tabernacle and temple, the two classical *loci* in the Hebrew scriptures of divine presence and theophany. Put, I hope, a little more precisely still, it turns around the «pattern» for divine worship, the tabernacle, which God reveals to Moses as, arguably, the very climax of the Sinai narrative in Ex. 25:9 ff.[144] Dionysius, quite consciously (see *EH* 5.1.2–4), applies that «pattern» to *both* the Christian assembly at worship, *and* to the Christian soul, and he does so in order to keep both anchored in each other and thus, mutually, in the revelation given once-for-all, *ephapax*, in Christ. My echoing of *Hebrews* is intentional here. In the latter's distinction (Heb 10:1) between «shadow» (*skia*) and «image» (*eikon*), we can arguably discern the germ of the *Areopagitica*. In fact, I think we can see a certain fundamental kinship between Dionysius and the whole Pauline corpus, particularly when we bear in mind that the Apostle, as is becoming increasingly clear in at least some recent scholarship, was often confronting claims to visionary authority very much akin to what I have argued here Dionysius was seeking to correct, corral, and finally harness to an ordered and responsible living-out of the Faith: sacramentally based, com-munity-centered, long-suffering, humble, non-judgemental, and suffused with charity.[145]

[144] On the importance of the temple traditions for early Christianity, and working backwards chronologically, see: M. Barker, On Earth as it is in Heaven: Temple Symbolism in the New Testament (Edinburgh, 1995) Esp. 7–11, 13–25, 61–72; C. R. Koester, The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Literature, and the New Testament (Washington, DC, 1989); and R. E. Clements, God and the Temple (Philadelphia, 1965).

[145] See, for example, the following: J. A. Fitzmeyer, Glory Reflected in the Face of Christ (2 Cor 3:7–4:6) and a Palestinian Jewish Motif // *TS* 42 (1981) 630–644; J. Blank, Gnosis und Agape: zur christologischen Struktur paulinischer Mystik // Grundfragen christlicher Mystik / Ed. M. Schmidt, D. R. Bauer (Stuttgart, 1987) 1–13; J. Tabor, Things Unutterable: Paul's Ascent to Heaven in its Greco-Roman, Judaic, and Early Christian Contexts (Lanham, MD, 1986) Esp. 11–21, 83–97; A. Segal, Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee (New Haven, 1990) Esp. 9–22, 34–71; M. Hengel, «Setzte dich zu meiner Rechten!» Die Intronisation Christi zur Rechten Gottes und Psalmen 110:1 // Le trône de Dieu / Ed. M. Philonenko (Tübingen, 1993) 108–194; C. R. A. Morray-Jones, Paradise Revisited (2 Cor 12:1–12): The Jewish Mystical Background of Paul's Apostolate // *HTR* 86.2 and 3

This places my hero within a tradition extending back into Christian origins. As I have also argued, he was drawing at the same time, and again very consciously, on more proximate Christian sources, notably fourth-century Syrian ascetical literature, whose own roots go back, in all probability, to the earliest forms and sites of Christianity: the Jewish-Christian villages and communities of Aramaic-speaking Palestine. These fourth-century sources as well — from Aphrahat and the *Liber Graduum* in the Persian empire east of the Tigris, to Ephrem and the *Macarian Homilies* in Roman Mesopotamia — were all likewise struggling with the same issues and drawing on the same or very similar sources in both canonical and extra-canonical literature.[146] It is in this Syrian, very Semitic context, and with regard to this theme, that is, the working-out of the Christian meaning of «temple», of the locus of theophany, that we are also to place Dionysius' recourse to late Neoplatonism, specifically to the latter's concern to defend «ancient rites» and piety against claims lodged in favor of the autonomous intellect. Overall, I think, at least as judging from his subsequent reception and the use to which he was put in the East, Dionysius' move here — for which he also had precedents in the long history of Jewish (e.g., the *Wisdom of Solomon* and Philo) and Christian Platonism — was generally understood and applauded. The bottom-line in any event is that he was *not* — even emphatically not — the proponent of a *theologia gloriae* in the Lutheran sense. Luther misread him, though I would not particularly blame the great doctor of the Reform for his error. His Dionysius

(1993) 177–217, 265–292; J. M. Scott, The Triumph of God in 2 Cor 2:14: Additional Evidence of Merkabah Mysticism in Paul // *NTS* 42 (1996) 260–281; together with a series of articles by M. Goulder, arguing not for St. Paul as mystic (to which idea Goulder is allergic), but certainly that he is using the vocabulary of, while arguing against, vison and ascent traditions among Jewish-Christians: Sophia in 1 Corinthians // *NTS* 37 (1991) 516–534; The Visionaries of Laodicea // *JSNT* 43 (1991) 15–39; Vision and Knowledge // *JSNT* 46 (1994) 53–71; and The Pastor's Wolves: Jewish-Christian Visionaries behind the Pastoral Epistles // *NT* 38.3 (1996) 242–256.

[146] Aphrahat, whom I have not touched on here, is strikingly insistent throughout his work on the Christian as the temple of God (a point for which I have to thank my student, Ms Stephanie Skoyles of Marquette University), and on internalizing the ascent traditions of the apocalypses. See thus his striking — not to say astounding — appropriation of these motifs from apocalyptic and (perhaps) contemporary *hekalot* literature in the portrait he offers of the transfigured Christian sage who has become himself the *locus gloriae* and site of the heavenly liturgy, in I. Parisot (ed.), Aphraatis Sapientis Persae Demonstrationes, Patrologia Syriaca I (Paris, 1894) XIV.35, columns 660:23–665:9. For comment, see J. Raasch, The Monastic Concept of Purity of Heart and its Sources. Part IV: The Early Monks // *StMon* 11.2 (1969) 269–314, here 280–281, linking this passage to *I Enoch* 14; and R. Murray, Some Themes and Problems of Early Syriac Angelology // V Symposium Syriacum, 1988 / Ed. R. Lavenant (Rome, 1990) 143–153, here 150–153, who compares it rather to the rabbinic-era *Sefer Hekalot*, or *3 Enoch*.

was, after all, already the product of centuries of prior misconstrual and of consequent mutation. On the other hand, the real (i.e., «my») Dionysius was hardly the advocate of a classically Lutheran *theologia crucis*, either, but then I cannot think offhand of *any* figure in the patristic age who would precisely meet that standard. Historical inquiry can do a great deal to clear up our differences, but it cannot simply dissolve them. They remain, yet even so I do not believe that they are enough to justify our dismissal of the *Corpus dionysiacum* as a passing — or perniciously influential — anomaly.

X. A Closing Illustration: The Mosaic of the Transfiguration at St. Catherine's, Sinai[147]

By way of a kind of epilogue, and as relief from academic argument, let me conclude this essay by turning to an artefact constructed within two or three decades of the first public mention of the Dionysian corpus. In the mid-sixth century, the same emperor who convoked the colloquium of 532, Justinian I, built a fortress monastery in the Sinai at the foot of Jebel Musa, the by-then traditional site associated with the theophanies of Exodus and, in consequence, already a longtime haunt of Christian ascetics.[148] In the monastery church, imperial artisans assembled several mosaics, including one depicting the Transfiguration. The latter is located in the apse, directly above the altar. Here already, as Jas Elsner has pointed out in a remarkably perceptive essay in his recent book, *Art and the Roman Viewer*,[149] we find the assemblage in a single glance of the major Dionysian themes: the God-man Christ in light, the altar of the eucharist, the Sinai of Moses' ascent, the Tabor of the Transfiguration, and the suggestions at once of mystical vision in this life open to the monks (and pilgrims) who form the worshipping body, and of the eschaton.

What I should like particularly to focus on, and which Elsner does not cover, is what I take to be elements from our discussion just now of the Epistles, and especially of Epistle III, reflected in the portrayl of Christ in this

[147] I have deployed the example of the Sinai mosaic in a number of earlier publications: Hierarchy versus Anarchy… 167, n. 148; *Et introibo ad altare dei*... 228, and at greatest length in «A Contemplative and a Liturgist»: Father Georges Florovsky on the *Corpus Dionysiacum* // *SVTQ* 43.2 (1999) 131–161, here 158–161.

[148] For the dating of the mosaic, see V. Beneševič, Sur la date de la mosaïque de la Transfiguration au Mont Sinai // *Byzantion* 1 (1924) 145–172; and for an analysis, E. Kitzinger, Byzantine Art in the Making (Cambridge, MA, 1977) 99–104, though the latter has been deepened by Elsner, cited below and n. 150. See also the remarkable photographs of the mosaic available in *National Geographic* 125.1 (Jan. 1964) 108–109 and 111. The last is especially illustrative of my remarks here, as it is taken from an angle looking directly up at the image from the altar, over which the image is centered.

[149] J. Elsner, Art and the Roman Viewer (Cambridge, 1995) 94–125.

mosaic — which, by the way and to the best of my knowledge, is the prototype for all subsequent Orthodox iconography of the Transfiguration. Christ is depicted clothed in brilliant white and gold. Rays shoot out from His Person to strike Elijah and Moses at His right and left, together with the stunned disciples at His feet — including, as Elsner points out, the figure of Peter, directly below, who is awakening from sleep into mystical vision. With the force of the rays we might also recall the *mesembria* pointed out by the anonymous Scholiast and certainly presumed in the Christophany to St Paul, as well as the «ray» imagery so generally prominent in the *CD*. In addition, the mandorla around Christ has a curious feature, also usually reproduced in later Byzantine icons. It is banded. At its outer edge a pale shade, roughly the same hue as the rays, its several rings of color grow increasingly dark as we move inwards until, immediately around the Person of Christ, the innermost ring is a midnight blue verging on black. At least two explanations have been proposed for this feature, both of which have a certain cogency. In one, the blue denotes the color of the firmament beneath God's feet in Exodus 24.10, a text which Evagrius takes up in his portrayl of the azure light of the intellect awaiting the descent of the uncreated light of the Trinity. In the other explanation, the mandorla represents both the bright cloud overshadowing the disciples at the Transfiguration, and the dark cloud on Sinai into which Moses enters. I think both of these apply, but I would go further than Elsner, who stops at the *MT*. In the epistles we saw a certain alternation, especially in Epistles I and V, between dark and light. In Epistle III we met the paradox of Christ's sudden manifestation: light, overpowering, coming forth from the depths of silent divinity and, still, hidden even in the manifestation. The Sinai mosaic strikes me, in short, as a portrayl of the *exaiphnes*. The latter, with its simultaneous evocation, via Malachi 3.1, of the twin temples of the altar and the heart also matches the image, a depiction of mystical vision sited directly over the table of the eucharist. It is, in fact, the *MT* located at the heart of the *EH*, with both united in the Person of Jesus.[150] Whoever, I think, commissioned that image knew his Dionysius very well, indeed.

ABSTRACT

The article takes the reader on a brief tour of the Dionysian corpus, beginning with tenth epistle, and then proceeding from the *Celestial* to the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, touching briefly on the *Divine Names*, and concluding with the *Mystical Theology* and the first five epistles.

[150] Thus the point of Louth's essay on Maximus' *Mystagogy*, cited above, n. 142. Thus: «Apophatic theology as Maximos envisages it... is the realization in the Christian soul of what is accomplished and celebrated in the Church's liturgy» (ibid. 38).

Hieromonk Alexander (Golitzin)
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

THE IMAGE AND GLORY OF GOD IN JACOB OF SERUG'S HOMILY, «ON THAT CHARIOT THAT EZEKIEL THE PROPHET SAW»

I. *Fides Adorans Mysterium*: The Theology of Jacob of Serug

We do not have much reliable biographical information about Jacob of Serug.[1] We know that he was born around the middle of the fifth century, the son of a parish priest in the town of Batnan of the region of Serug in the largely Syriac-speaking, Roman province of Osrhoene. He was himself ordained to the priesthood as a celibate in the early 470's, and served as circuit inspector and preacher, *chorepiskopos* or *periodeutes*, in the region of his birth. In 519, he was consecrated bishop of his native town and died there just over two years later. His works include over three hundred extant verse and prose homilies, together with several dozen letters,[2] while his reputation in

[1] See the useful introduction by J. Kollamparampil to his translation, Jacob of Serug, *Select Festal Homilies* (Rome—Bangalore, 1997) 1–33, here 1–15, for Jacob's life and context.

[2] The Syriac texts of Jacob's homilies were published, most of them, in the following editions by Paulus Bedjan: Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum I–VIII (Paris, 1890–1897); Sancti Martyrii, qui et Sahdona supersunt omnia (Paris, 1902) (note that these collections contain works by other authors as well as Jacob), and Homiliae selectae Mar Jacobi Sarugensis I–V (Paris—Leipzig, 1905–1910). Jacob's 43 surviving letters were edited by G. Olinder, Jacobi Sarugensis: Epistulae quotquot supersunt (Paris, 1935, rep. CSCO, 110, 1965). More critical editions of selected homilies and letters, together with accompanying French translations, include the following: M. Albert (ed.), Homélies contre les Juifs par Jacques de Saroug // *PO* 38 (1976) 1–247; F. Rilliet (ed.), Jacques de Saroug: six homélies festales en prose // *PO* 43. 515–663; K. Alwan, Quatre homélies metriques sur la création (Lovanii, 1989) (CSCO, 508/509); and, in English, J. Amar, A Metrical Homily on Holy Mar Ephrem by Mar Jacob of Serug // *PO* 47 (1995) 1–75. M. Hansbury has recently translated a series of Jacob's homilies on Mary Theotokos: Jacob of Serug on the Mother of God (New York, 1998), with useful notes by the translator (especially in reference to Jewish traditions), and an introduction by S. Brock. For the many other translations of single homilies into French or English which have appeared over the past century and more, several of which will also be appearing in my remarks and notes below, see the fairly comprehensive (up to 1995) listing supplied by Kollamparampil, Jacob of Serug, *Select Festal Homilies*... 370–379, and, up to 1986, the very thorough bibiliography

the world of Syriac-speaking Christianity — at least of the West Syrians — is second only to St. Ephrem Syrus († 373), whom Jacob himself revered as his own model and inspiration in theology and exegesis.[3]

In so far as he is known at all to English speakers, Jacob is associated in a kind of troika with his two contemporaries, Philoxenus of Mabbug and Severus of Antioch, who spearheaded the resistence to Chalcedon from the 490's into the early decades of the sixth century. This association, which I think not altogether just in view of his express loathing for the sort of polemical spirit which so often informed the writings of the other two men, is assumed by the title of the one study in English exclusively devoted to all three, Roberta Chestnut Bondi's *Three Monophysite Christologies*, published in 1976.[4] The latter's specific focus on Jacob's christology is, to the best of my limited knowledge, unique in English, though there is a more extensive literature devoted to him in French and German.[5] I am very grateful to Professor Bondi's book, since it was her section on Jacob, with its abundant citations from his works, which directed me to the subject of this essay, his homily on the

by K. Alwan, Bibliographie générale raisonnée de Jacques de Saroug // *ParOr* 13 (1986) 313–384.

[3] See Amar, A Metrical Homily on Holy Mar Ephrem…, esp. the introduction, 18–21, and, at somewhat greater length on Jacob's theological debt to Ephrem, the articles by T. Jansma, Die Christologie Jacobs von Serugh und ihre Abhängigkeit von der alexandrinischen Theologie und der Frömmigkeit Ephraems des Syrers // *Mus* 78 (1965) 5–65, esp. 44–45, and idem, Encore le Credo de Jacques de Saroug: nouvelles recherches sur l'argument concernant son orthodoxie // *OrSyr* 10 (1965) 75–88, 193–226, 331–370, and 475–510, esp. 349–350.

[4] R. Chestnut, Three Monophysite Christologies (Oxford, 1976), which, curiously, appears to have been written without reference to the very useful articles by Jansma noted just above, n.3. I might add, since I am going to be taking issue with her reading of Jacob, that I had the occasion to talk to Dr. Chestnut Bondi a few years ago and was very happy to learn that she no longer endorses the opinions in her book that I shall be criticizing. So our quarrel is, as it were, purely «academic». In view of the fact that hers is still one of the very few works on Jacob available in English, however, I do feel obliged to offer my remarks here.

[5] See again the bibliography supplied by Kollamparampil, Jacob of Serug, *Select Festal Homilies*... 383–398, though few of the entries touch directly on the christological issue, save Jansma's (above, n. 3), which I would have to reckon still the best to date. For Jacob himself on the christological controversy of his day, see J. Obeid (tr.), Deuxième epître de Jacques de Saroug sur la foi // *ParOr* 12 (1984–1985) 187–199 (Syriac in Olinder, Jacobi Sarugensis: Epistulae quotquot supersunt… 11–16); P. Krüger, Le caractère monophysite de la troisième lettre de Jacques de Saroug // *OrSyr* 6 (1961) 301–308 (= Olinder 28–34); J.-P. P. Martin, Lettres aux moines du couvent Mar Bassus // *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländishschen Gesellschaft* 30 (1876) 220–275 (= Olinder 42–45, 58–86, and 241–246); and F. Graffin, Le thème de la perle dans une lettre de Jacques de Saroug // *OrSyr* 12 (1967) 355–370.

chariot (*markabta*) of Ezekiel, and which first signaled its echoes of the Rabbinic-era, Jewish mysticism of the *merkavah*. At the same time, however, I am deeply at odds with her reading of his thought, which displays what I take to be a marked dependence on the earlier — and, in important ways, superseded — scholarship of the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* of such early twentieth-century luminaries as, for example, Wilhelm Bousset, Richard Reitzenstein, and Rudolph Bultmann. The presence of Oriental, chiefly Iranian motifs which these scholars believed they saw in the literature of Gnosticism and, relative to Jacob, in such early Syriac works as the *Odes of Solomon* and the apocryphal *Acts of Thomas*,[6] deeply affect Bondi's analysis, since our circuit preacher makes relatively frequent allusions to passages in the *Acts*.[7] She thus characterizes Jacob as «overly mythological», indeed as «gnosticizing», and so finally as «rightfully worthy of rejection» by Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian theologians alike.[8]

The reality is quite different, and I think my view is supported by certain shifts in scholarship that were beginning to take place even as Bondi was writing her book, such as, for example, Robert Murray's remarkable *Symbols of Church and Kingdom* on early Syriac-speaking Christian literature,[9] or the flood of articles and editions of texts emerging from the pen of Sebastian Brock,[10] or, also during the 1970's and extending into the 80's, the re-evaluation of apocalyptic literature, Christian origins, and the analysis of Gnosticism which had begun to look to more proximate (as opposed to distant Iranian), Jewish sources for the reading of these ancient texts.[11] We can find a

[6] For critique of the old history of religions school, see J. Fossum, The New *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*: The Quest for a Jewish Christology // *SBLSP* 30 (1991) 638–646. For an example of the old school at work on Syriac Christian texts, see G. Bornkam's «Introduction» to the *Acts of Thomas* in W. Schneemelcher (ed.), The Apocryphal New Testament / Tr. R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia, 1965) Vol. 2. 425–442 — thus his view of «the Gnostic Christianity of Syria in the third century», p. 440.

[7] See, for example, Three Monophysite Christologies… 113–118 on «Jacob's Mythological System», and 128–131 on his «Secret Jesus».

[8] Ibid. 141.

[9] R. Murray, Symbols of Church and Kingdom: A Study in Early Syriac Christianity (Cambridge, 1975).

[10] S. Brock's bibliography would require a modest volume. See, merely for example, the following: Mary in Syriac Tradition (London, 1977); The Holy Spirit in the Syriac Baptismal Tradition (Kottayam, 1979); The Syriac Fathers on Prayer and the Spiritual Life (Kalamazoo, 1987); Studies in Syriac Spirituality (Poona, 1988); Studies in Syriac Christianity (Hampshire, 1992); and The Luminous Eye: The Spiritual World Vision of St. Ephrem (rev. ed., Kalamazoo, 1992).

[11] Again, the list could be very long here. For examples, see D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic (Phil, 1965); A. Segal, Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism (Leiden, 1977);

striking instance of this shift in the respective — and stunningly different — analyses of the *Acts of Thomas* offered by Gunter Bornkam in the early 1960's for the first edition of W. Schneemelcher's anthology, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, and, thirty years later, by Han Drijvers for the second edition of the *same* anthology, where the change in direction is practically absolute. Bornkam sees nothing but «Gnosticism» and Iranian motifs in the apocryphon, while Drijers barely breathes the word, «gnostic», and does so chiefly in order to dismiss it and insist instead on the fundamentally Jewish-Christian character of the document, including the justly famous «Hymn of the Pearl», which Bornkam had seen as totally devoid of Christian elements.[12]

In light of this re-evaluation, much — or, in fact, all — of Jacob's «mythology» resolves into the themes of classical Christian preaching: for example, the «hiddeness of God», the angelic and earthly liturgies, the creation and fall of Adam, and the Word of God's descent into incarnation, death, and hell itself in order — using the language of the liturgy ascribed to Basil of Caesarea — «to fill all things with Himself».[13] True, he confines himself

---

IDEM, Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee (New Haven, 1990); C. ROWLAND, The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity (New York, 1982); J. COLLINS, The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity (New York, 1984); J. FOSSUM, The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord (Tübingen, 1985); IDEM, The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology (Freiburg—Göttingen, 1995); M. Himmelfarb, Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses (New York—Oxford, 1993); J. C. REEVES, Heralds of that Good Realm: Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions (Leiden, 1996); and A. DECONICK, Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas (Leiden, 1996). The grandfather of this re-reading is, in good part, Gershom SCHOLEM. See thus his Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (1941, rep. New York, 1973); and Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and the Talmudic Tradition (1960, New York, 1965[2]). For an early application, quite ahead of its time, of Scholem's insights to the study of a major figure in Eastern Christian ascetico-mystical literature, see G. QUISPEL, Makarios, das Thomasevangelium, and das Lied von der Perle (Leiden, 1967). More recently on the same background in earlier Syrian Christian asceticism, see IDEM, The Study of Encratism: A Historical Survey // La Tradizione dell'Enkrateia / Ed. U. BIANCHI (Rome, 1985) 35–81; together with G. G. STROUMSA on a fourth-century, Syrian monastic sect: Jewish and Gnostic Traditions among the Audians // Sharing the Sacred: Religious Contacts and Conflicts in the Holy Land / Eds. G. G. STROUMSA, A. KOFSKY (Jerusalem, 1998) 345–358 (my thanks to Professor Stroumsa for kindly sending me an offprint of his article).

[12] H. DRIJVERS, «Introduction», *Acts of Thomas* // New Testament Apocrypha (Phil, 1991[2]) Vol. 2. 322–337, esp. 330–333 on the «Hymn of the Pearl» — «one of the most beautiful products of Syriac literature», p. 320.

[13] See S. BROCK's remarks on Jacob's «mythology» in Baptismal Themes in the Writings of Jacob of Serug // OCA 203 (1978) 325–347, here 325–326.

entirely to scriptural and related language, that is, to the diction of biblical and traditional imagery, and avoids like plague the abstract terminology of Greek philosophy. One might even speak of a kind of deliberately archaizing quality to his writings.[14] In any case, he detested in consequence the sort of learned, philosophical theology which he believed had done so much to prompt and sustain the christological controversy of his era — better that Nestorius had never been born, he grumbles in one letter[15] — but this animus toward rational (or rationalistic) analysis of the things of God is part and parcel of his deeply traditional emphasis on a kind of «learned ignorance» or, more positively, on what he himself refers as «wonder» — worship, we would say — before the mystery of the God become man. As he puts it himself in one of his letters:

> This is why the discerning soul should abandon the debate [over Christ] and be filled [instead] with the wonder of Christ. Let it be filled with the wonder Who is Christ! Whoever pries into the unsearchably Begotten [of the Father] no longer has wonder, and this is to say that he no longer has Christ in himself. If some investigation has set him off in search of wonder, this is because he has lost that wonder... Therefore, O soul, make haste rather to wonder, and take care to love. Be ready to worship. Keep yourself in a state of wonder... Open the door of your spirit to wonder.[16]

Robert Murray's characterization of Ephrem Syrus' theology as *fides adorans mysterium* holds fully for Jacob as well, which should come as no surprise in view of the latter's reverence for Ephrem as his model and guide in divinity.[17]

The accusation, «gnosticizing», while not true, is nonetheless perhaps more interesting, at least for me, in that it opens onto roughly the same territory that I have been poking into for the past several years and which drew me to the homily on the chariot in the first place: the origins and continuities of Christian asceticism and mysticism. The very fact that Jacob devoted a homily, and a very long one at that, to Ezekiel's chariot vision puts him at least

[14] See thus Jansma, Die Christologie Jacobs von Serugh… 44–45.

[15] Martin, Lettres aux moines du couvent de Mar Bassus… 248.

[16] Krüger, «Le caractère monophysite de la troisième lettre de Jacques de Saroug… 306–307 (= Olinder 19, ll. 16 ff.). On «wonder», together with love, as Jacob's keys for the approach to Scripture, see B. M. Boulos Sony, La méthode exégetique de Jacques de Saroug // *ParOr* 9 (1979–1980) 67–103, here 83–84.

[17] Murray, Symbols of Church and Kingdom… 89. For «wonder» as charged with the sense of religious transport, the Greek *ekstasis*, in the later writings of Isaac of Nineveh, see H. Alfeyev, The Spiritual World of Isaac the Syrian (Kalamazoo, 2000) 241–248; and cf. the richly suggestive, contemporary application of the category, «wonder», by Bishop Seraphim Sigrist, Theology of Wonder (Torrance, CA, 1999).

in rough parallel with the contemporary, Jewish mysticism of the *merkabah*, the divine chariot throne, and I myself think that the parallel is quite real and deliberate. Both Jacob's homily and the rabbinic-era literature of the *hekhalot*, the heavenly palaces — together, I might add, with many of the documents from the Nag Hammadi trove — share common roots in the much earlier, Second Temple-era literature of those Jewish apocalypses which featured an ascent to heaven and a vision of the divine throne. Both Jacob and the Jewish mystics are concerned with the contemporary possibility of experiencing Ezekiel's vision of the enthroned Glory of God, and in this they share with one of the oldest passages in apocalyptic literature, the ascent and *visio gloriae* of Enoch in *I Enoch* 14.[18] Jacob, though, differs from the Jewish *merkabah* tradition in certain fundamental respects, most notably of course in his identification of the enthroned Glory with Christ, but also, secondly, in his assertion that the place of the Glory's abiding is the altar of the Christian Eucharist. For our preacher, heaven and earth have been joined in Christ, Who has broken down the «wall of enmity» between those above and those below. Jacob, therefore, writes precisely *against* the possibility or necessity of the «ascent to heaven», and I shall come back to that theme later on in this essay.

«The wall of enmity» recalls the passage on the «one new man» in Eph. 2:14–15. The latter is one of several New Testament passages which resonate throughout both this homily and, indeed, virtually all of Jacob's works that fall under Dr. Bondi's consideration, though, rather curiously, she fails to cite any one of the key scriptural *loci* specifically.[19] These passages are, in particular, the «one mediator» of I Tim. 2:5, the hymn of Col. 1:15–20 on Christ as joining together heaven and earth, and, most especially, Phil. 2:6–7: that He who was «in the form [*morphe*] of God» emptied himself to take on the «form of a servant» and the «likeness [*schema*] of a man». The last especially, together with its obvious importance for the christological debate (Cyril of

[18] There is a considerable literature on *I Enoch* and its resonances in later apocalyptic literature. For an accessible discussion of its origins in Ezk 1 and importance for later apocalypses of ascent, see Himmelfarb, Ascent to Heaven… 9–46. The extension of this trajectory into the Syriac Christian literature of the fourth and subsequent centuries does not, regrettably, feature significantly in current scholarship. For two partial exceptions regarding Aphrahat of Persia (fl. 330's–340's), however, see J. Raasch, The Monastic Concept of Purity of Heart and Its Sources. Part IV: The Early Monks // *StMon* 11.2 (1969) 280–281; and R. Murray, Some Themes and Problems of Early Syriac Angelology // V Symposium Syriacum (Rome, 1990) 150–151. Interestingly, Murray sees Aphrahat playing in *Demonstration* 14.35 off of *3 Enoch*, a Rabbinic-era *hekhalot* text.

[19] See, for example, Three Monophysite Christologies… 123–126 on the *schema* of Christ as man, though without citation of Phil 2:6–7, and the same lack of this text in her discussion of Christ in the «form of servant» in 129, or of Eph 2:15 in 135–136.

Alexandria, for example, refers to it nearly as often as he does Jn. 1:14[20]), is also — at least for certain contemporary scholars — itself related to the notion of the Glory of God, the *kevod YHWH*, which features so prominently in many of the Old Testament theophanies,[21] and this, too, is to be borne in mind in our consideration of Jacob's thought. Phillipians 2:6–7 is thus, thirdly, and now we move at last to the homily itself, the very center and pivot of Jacob's long meditation on Ezekiel's chariot.

II. The Homily on the Chariot

The homily is very long, indeed, between thirteen and fourteen hundred lines and running to over sixty pages in Paulus Bedjan's edition of Jacob's homilies.[22] If length is any indication of the importance a writer accords his topic, then Jacob very clearly thought Ezekiel's vision rated quite special attention. I myself believe, although this would have to be the subject of another paper, that he is directing his words to certain among his listeners who were attracted by the idea of ascending to the heavenly throne, like Enoch in the old apocalypses, and, if one friend of mine who is more versed than I in matters Jacobean is correct in understanding his audience as primarily monks,[23] then we are in fact in the presence of those ancient currents of ascetical mysticism which are of particular interest to me. As I just noted, however, Jacob sets his face against the notion of ascent, and his opposition to this tradition comprises what I would venture to call the secondary theme, or even the

[20] See J. McGuckin, Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy, Its History, Theology, and Texts (Leiden, 1994) Esp. the «Scriptural Index», p. 425 (twelve references, and likewise twelve for Jn 1:24). Curiously, A. Grillmeier restricts his discussion of Phil 2:6–7 almost exclusively to Nestorius: Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon / Tr. J. Bowden (Atlanta, 1975²) 511 ff., save one, fleeting reference to the early Cyril in 304–305. My own impression, admittedly superficial, is that it was Nestorius who had to struggle with the text. Cyril seems to take its unity of subject for granted and deploys it accordingly.

[21] See M. Bochmuehl, The «Form of God» (Phil 2:6): Variations on a Theme of Jewish Mysticism // *JTS* ns 48.1 (1997) 1–23 and, twenty years ago, the coyly allusive article by Quispel, Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis // *VC* 34 (1980) 1–13. On the OT tradition of the *kavod*, see esp. T. D. N. Mettinger, The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies (Lund, 1982) 80–115.

[22] *Homiliae selectae* IV:543–610. In order to avoid a greater clutter of notes, I shall be including page and line numbers from Bedjan's edition in the body of my article following citations from the homily. I should also take this opportunity to declare my heartfelt gratitude to Sebastian Brock for his extraordinary kindness in offering to correct the draft of my translation. Let the reader be assured that I have incorporated every one of his corrections and suggestions — and there were a lot of them!

[23] I take this point from conversations with Susan Ashbrook Harvey, and hope that she does not mind my citing her here.

subtext, of his homily. The latter's first concern, though, is to link the chariot vision with the divine economy in Christ.

With these preliminary remarks in mind, let me proceed to a sketch of the homily and then to a few concluding remarks. The whole huge piece revolves around three fundamental texts: Ezekiel 1, especially verses 26–28; Genesis 1, again particularly verses 26–27; and, as noted above, Phillipians 2:6–7. The link between all three is the Syriac term, *dmuta* or «likeness». In Jacob's Syriac Bible, the *Peshitta*, this is the single word which is used to render at once its Hebrew equivalent, *demut*, found in both Gen. 1:26 and Ezk. 1:26 and 28, and the *morphe*, «form», of Phil. 2:6–7. Jacob is the only the patristic author I know of to dwell at such length on the linkage of these three texts, though he is obviously helped by the translation he used.

A. Divine Transcendence, the *Imago Dei*, and Macrocosm/Microcosm

The homily opens with what is for Jacob a typically apophatic note, stressing the mystery of God's transcendence, the «hidden One» Who is «seated on the unsearchable chariot» and is infinitely above the angels, the «assemblies of the sons of light» (543–544).[24] Again typically, Jacob begs for the gift of «a new mouth» in order to offer fitting praise: «Lord most high, my mouth is insufficient for Your praise: make a new mouth for me that it may proclaim Your song» (544:18–19)[25] It is at this point that the first note of the *imago dei* appears, that is, that it is precisely the office of the human tongue — or, indeed, as we might say, of the mind — to offer up worship. While God could have made the dumb creation sing His praises, this task has been set aside specifically for the speech-endowed image. As Jacob writes:

> Let everything created abide in what is its own, as at its creation: ...the sea for fish and the earth that it may bear the sons of men... And the image with speech, that it may be stirred all the day to Your praise.
> «The very pulse of my created being», he adds, «requires Your praise» (546:2–8).[26]

In the next section of over a hundred lines, Jacob moves in effect to a paraphrase and meditation on the opening lines of Genesis. After dwelling

[24] God as the «hidden», the «Hidden One», etc., appears very frequently in Jacob. On the dialectic of «hidden/revealed» in his master, Ephrem, as «between apophatic and cataphatic poles», see R. Murray, The Theory of Symbolism in St. Ephrem's Theology // *ParOr* 6/7 (1975–1976) 1–20, here 11, and cf. Jansma, Die Christologie Jacobs von Serough… 38–43, on the same in Jacob.

[25] See Boulos Sony, La méthode exégetique… 67–68, and again 83–84 for Jacob's insistence on the need for divine grace to interpret the scriptures.

[26] The entire section on the speech-endowed image runs to over a page, 545:7–546:11.

again at length on God's infinitiy and unsearchability (546:12–7:18), he moves on to consider the divine power, *haila*, and sign, *remza*, which uphold and govern the universe after bringing it into being from nothing (547:18–552:2).[27] God's power carries the cosmos like the force of a man's arm sustains a stone thrown into the air (552:3–3:19). This similitude allows Jacob to bring into play the ancient theme of the human being as microcosm: «The Power abides in the creation», he writes, «like a soul [abides] in its members» (553:20 and ff.).[28] Here I should add that, at least on occasion, the term «power» is more than simply a way for Jacob of speaking about God *ad extra*. It sometimes overlaps with the Second Person of the Trinity.[29] Put another way, I take him as engaging in something very like the old Logos theology of the Apologists and Alexandrines, with the Word of God acting as the divine immanence and power at work in creation, indeed, as almost a kind of world soul.[30] Microcosmos and macrocosmos, or anthropos and makranthropos, reflect one another, and Jacob thus goes on to speak of the human intellect, *hauna*, specifically as the «image [*tsalma*] of the Great Being» (556:2 ff.).[31] Both, the image and the original, are not confined by their respective bodies:

> Heaven does not contain the Lord, although He dwells in it, Nor does the body contain the intellect, though it soujourns in it. (556:10–11)

If the body does not contain the intellect, it still seems to be the appointed place for the latter to gather itself and meet God. I venture this thought, which

[27] The whole section is over five pages, 547:18–552:2. On the mysterious term and concept, *remza*, see K. Alwan, Le '*Remzo*' selon la pensée de Jacques de Saroug // *ParOr* 15 (1988–1989) 91–106. Alwan concludes (104) that it resembles the *logos* in creation, having affinities with the Stoic *logos* and Platonic demiurge. Curiously, he makes no mention of the Logos Christology of the Apologists as a possible influence on Jacob at the School of Edessa, whence Alwan believes Jacob takes the idea; see 95 and 104–105.

[28] On man as microcosm in Jacob, see B. M. Boulos Sony, L'anthropologie de Jacques de Saroug // *ParOr* 12 (1984–1985) 153–185, here 182–183, and at greater length, K. Alwan, L'homme le 'microcosme' selon Jacques de Saroug // *ParOr* 13 (1986) 57–78. For the origins of the idea in Greek philosophy, see A. Meyer, Wesen und Geschichte der Theorie von Mikro- and Makrocosmos (Bern, 1900) 1–46.

[29] See 544:12–14, 556:8–9, 599:13, and 603:18, where «Power» appears clearly to be taken as a name of the Son. Jacob could, of course, have had in mind I Cor 1:24 and the long subsequent play of this verse in the history of early christology. See in this regard M. R. Barnes, The Power of God: Dynamis in Gregory of Nyssa's Trinitarian Theology (Washington, DC, 2001) 94–124.

[30] See again Alway, Le '*Remzo*'… 100–1, if without reference to the Apologists and Alexandrians — though he does suggest the influence of the former in Alwan, L'homme le 'microcosme'… 72 and 76–77.

[31] See esp. Boulos Sony, L'anthropologie de Jacques de Saroug… 171–184, esp. 175–177 on the *hauna* as image.

Jacob does not elaborate on in this homily (or in any other of his works that I have read), because it is a fundamental theme in the Christian spiritual tradition to which I think he belonged, and for which there were many precedents in both Syriac and Greek Christian literature. We shall come back, briefly, to this note later on in the essay. For now, however, there is the matter of Ezekiel's *markabta*.

B. Ezekiel and the Chariot Vision: A Great Mystery

The fallen intellect's penchant for travelling outside the bounds in which it ought to remain — «If your intellect obeys you», Jacob writes, «confine it to the place of the body, that it may gaze within» (557:9–10) — provides our homilist with the opening for his discussion of Ezekiel's vision. In the prophet's case, the heavens were truly opened. Trembling, Jacob says, he beheld the fiery angels and

> The high throne... and, glorious upon the backs Of the ministering cherubim of fire who bear it, The wondrous Glory... the Son of the Creator, Who is seated there on the high place... (558:15–19)

Let me pause here to note the clear identification of the Second Person with the divine Glory that Ezekiel sees on the chariot throne of the theophany, «in appearance as the likeness of a man» (Ezk 1:26, *kmar'eh demut adam*). In this instance, the Syriac word for «glory» that Jacob uses is *shubha*, but he deploys the more technical terms, *shekinta* (the Aramaic equivalent of the Rabbinic *shekinah*), *iqara* (the Aramaic term which usually renders the Hebrew *kavod*, «glory», in the *Peshitta*), and *rabbuta* (majesty or, more literally, «greatness») in other passages of the homily, just as we have seen him identify the Word, at least occasionally, with the *haila* or power.[32] At this point Jacob sounds a theme that he will come back to, the secondary one or subtext I noted above. The vision of the heavenly throne and its ministering angels, he writes, which the «questing intellect» seeks is dreadful and terrible while, on the other hand, «the table of the King is full of blessing for whomever reclines at it» (559:15–16). Not for us humans, in other words, is the vision of

[32] For *shekinta*, see 569:21, 570:13, 582:11, and 602:20; for *iqara*, 559:13 (as an attribute of the Power, i.e., the Son), 563:2, 571:17, 576:2 (the Son made a habitation for his *iqara*), and 592:5 (the *iqara* upon the chariot); and *rabbuta*, 570, 19, 595:8, and 604:10. Jacob is not alone among Syrian Christians in his use of *shekinta*. Prior to him, see Aphrahat in *Demonstrations* 4.7, 18.4, and 19.4 (*PS* 1, ed. Parisot, col. 152:1–2, 828:28, and 857:6–7), and nearly two centuries after our preacher, Isaac of Nineveh. For the use of *shekinta* in the latter, see Alfeyev, The Spiritual World of Isaac of Nineveh… 45, 165, 167–168, and 170–171. It appears therefore to have served as something of a *terminus technicus* for, I take it, the Second Person in Syrian Christian circles for centuries, though I know of no studies that have been devoted to this question.

the chariot assigned the angels, but rather the altar of the Eucharist — though perhaps also suggested here is the idea that the human being is him- or herself to become a «table of blessings» for others.[33]

Ezekiel is then interrogated about his vision, and Jacob paraphrases the biblical passage at length, dwelling with particular gusto on the strange forms of the «living creatures», the *haywata* (Hebrew *hayyot*), who carry and accompany the throne, and who appear so prominently in some Old Testament pseudepigrapha as well as in the Jewish *merkabah* literature,[34] together with the appearance of the Glory (here *iqara*) as a man seated on the sapphire throne (560:5–563:2). How then, Jacob wonders at considerable length, are we to interpret this extraordinary vision, unique in the prophetic books (563:3–568:13)? Not, he insists, by «prying into that Lamp [i.e., the Son] of the Great Light». The vision, the forms which the angels take on within it, and the appearance of the Lamp and Glory as a man, properly overwhelm rational thought. Only learned fools would seek to explain it in the terms of the worldly wise. So, our preacher says, he will «not promise an explanation, but rather wonder» before the paradox of «the Word of God mounted on the cherubim» even when it is He, the Son, Who is in truth the One Who carries both them and all creation (568:14–569:17).

C. The Mystery of the Incarnate Word Who Came to Reconcile Heaven and Earth

Although he promises no explanation, Jacob does, of course, set out to deliver one. It comes in two parts. In part one, we start by touching on the very important — and ancient — theme of the tie between the worship of heaven and earth. Jacob begins with the worship of heaven. The chariot is explained as having been created for the sake of the angels, since otherwise

[33] I borrow this suggestion from one of Sebastian Brock's notes in the margins of my translation. So far as I can tell, however, Jacob does not dwell in this homily, or in any other of his works that I have read, on the interior reflection of the divine Glory. For perhaps some suggestion along these lines, see S. A. Harvey (tr.), Jacob of Serug: Homily on Simeon the Sylite // Ascetic Behavior in Greco-Roman Antiquity: A Sourcebook / Ed. V. M. Wimbush (Minneapolis, 1990) 15–28, esp. the references to the «palace» of the saint's body, p.21, and the same as «temple» on p. 23 (Syriac in Bedjan, Acta Martyrum… 650–665, here 655 and 659). See also Boulos Sony, L'anthropologie de Jacques de Saroug… 176–177. On the theme elsewhere in Syriac-Christian literature of the human being as, in Christ, the temple and site of the heavenly liturgy and divine presence, see Murray, Symbols of Church and Kingdom… 262–276, together with S. Brock, «Fire from Heaven»: From Abel's Sacrifice to the Eucharist. A Theme in Syriac Spirituality // *SP* 25 (1989) 229–243, esp. 239–242.

[34] On the appearance of the *hayyot* in Jewish mystical literature, see P. Schäfer, The Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism / Tr. A. Pomeranz (Albany, 1992) Esp. 21–27, 62–64, and 129–132.

God, Who in Himself is hidden even from them, would have given the sons of light cause for confusion and alarm. I think the passage worth quoting at some length:

> And they would have been looking in all directions in order to see Him.
> And the assembly of the choirs on high would have been scattered by this,
> And the powers would have disintegrated without any order [*taksis*],
> And debates would have multiplied even there [i.e., on high], with this one saying to that one:
> «Where is He? Where is the exalted One who is hidden, that we may praise Him in His place?» [cf. Ezk 3:12]
> For this reason He harnessed the chariot and made the place known
> ...and depicted a place for his Presence/Glory [*shekinta*], that there it might dwell,
> And He made it like a chariot, that on it He might be carried in state,
> That the whole vision of the heavenly ones might be concentrated, caught up, and tied
> To that one place where His banner is set...
> And lightning and fearful radiance issue from the chariot, to assemble the heavenly ones to great praise...
> They all cry out to one another at the entry to His place.
> All the choirs gather and stand at the gate of the King...
> [and the angels] all look toward that secondary place...
> And are soothed by it, and shout praise before His Glory [*iqara*].
> (570:6–571:19)[35]

The angels would have been without means for praise had God not provided them with the «place» of the *markabta*, which is thus a fundamental part — I would read it as the so-to-speak sanctuary or nave — of the heavenly temple or palace (*haikla*, equivalent of the Hebrew *hekhal*). Here again, we touch on traditions that extend back into the Second Temple era.[36]

---

[35] For Jacob on the heavenly palace as temple, together with the chariot throne and angelic hosts, as the first of God's creative acts, see Jacob of Serug 'On the Establishment of Creation. Memra One: The First Day / Tr. R. D. Young // J. W. Trigg (ed.), Biblical Interpretation / (Wilmington, 1988) 184–202, here 191–195 (Syriac in *Homiliae selectae* 3.4–27). Note esp. the phrases: «the temple of light», «the great tent [i.e., tabernacle]», and the «bridal chamber of light», all on p. 193. Note that while the «heavenly temple» is created, its «holy of holies» is not. Thus cf. below.

[36] On the notion of a correspondence obtaining between the heavenly and earthly temples. see, relative to the Old Testament (and Rabbinic traditions), J. D. Levenson, Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible (SF, 1985) 111–184, and, drawing on both Old and New Testaments (together with the OT Pseudepigrapha, Christian Apocrypha, Rabbinic traditions, and some patristic literature), M. Barker, The Gate of Heaven: The History and Symbolism of the Temple in Jerusalem (London, 1991) Esp. her chapter on «The Veil», 104–132.

Our preacher then links the worship in the «place» on high to earth when he suggests that Ezekiel was granted his vision of the heavenly liturgy because he was in exile, mourning the loss of the Temple on Zion and of its services, and grieved by the proud display of Israel's foes. Thus the vision assures him that, «even if God's ministry in the land of Judah had ceased: See! His praise thunders richly among the cherubim!» (572:9–4:6, here 573:21–22). The sight of, in effect, the most sacred furniture of the celestial temple — thus consider the likely relationship between the *kapporet*, «mercy seat», of the Ark and the chariot throne of the vision[37] — comforts the prophet for the (temporary) loss of its terrestrial copy. Jacob will return in order to expand at greater length on this note of the linkage between the worship of heaven and earth, and of the «place» where God is to be sought and found.

For now, however, it is the prophetic vocation of the son of Buzi which draws Jacob's attention. In his understanding, all biblical prophecy touches on «the mysteries [*raze*] of the Son of God» (574:10). The use of the term, «mysteries», here refers not to some esoteric doctrine of Jesus, which Dr. Bondi seems to think is the case in her section on Jacob's «secret Jesus», but rather to the divine economy accomplished in Christ.[38] Mystery, *raza*, in this homily, as in all of Jacob's work, together with Aphrahat and Ephrem before him, is an Aramaic word taken from the lexicon of apocalyptic literature, where it signaled the secrecy of the divine counsel which is revealed to the seer, as, for example, in Daniel 2:18 ff. In the Pauline and deutero-Pauline epistles, such as most notably in Eph. 1:9 and Col. 1:26, its Greek translation, *mysterion*, is deployed to signal Christ, Who is God's intent or purpose for us and for all creation, the hitherto hidden goal and summation of the divine plan. This is then the sense in which it is used by the Syrian writers, who deploy it to signify the hidden meaning of the Old Testament. It is the justification for what Origen would call the «mystical» or «spiritual» sense of the Hebrew scriptures, or what we might call, simply, the christological reading.[39] It is there-

[37] See R. Elior, The Priestly Nature of the Mystical Heritage in Hekhalot Literature // Expérience et écritures mystiques dans les réligions du livre / Ed. P. B. Fenton, R. Goetschel (Leiden, 2000) 41–54, here 49: «...a substantial portion of the concepts mentioned in Ezekiel's consecration vision are visionary abstractions of the ritual objects of the temple mentioned in I Kings 7:23–27, 8:6–9, and II Chronicles 3:7–14, 4:3–5 and 14–15 — a visionary metamorphosis into the awesome figures of the Holy Creatures», i.e, the *hayyot* or cherubim. This is, of course, something of a rationalist's explanation. One could just as easily say that Ezekiel saw the heavenly originals of «the Mercy Seat». For the text and analysis of an important example of pre-Christian, Jewish traditions regarding the heavenly temple, including the «descent of the *merkavah*», see C. Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition (Atlanta, 1985).

[38] Three Monophysite Christologies… 128–131.

[39] See E. Beck, Symbolum-Mysterium bei Aphraat und Ephrem // *OC* 42 (1958) 19–40; and relatedly, I. H. Dalmais, Raza et sacrament // Rituels: Mélanges offerts à

fore through the Son of God, Jacob says, that the Father spoke to all the prophets, and it is the same Son who is Himself the content of their message: «the mystery [*raza*] of all the mysteries [*raze*] of prophecy» (574:11–16). Ezekiel's vision is no exception to this rule: it was Christ whom the prophet saw on the chariot, just as Daniel had seen Him «borne on the clouds». Here we arrive at the literal and architectural center of the homily, the point where all three texts I noted earlier converge. Quoting Jacob:

> Daniel saw Him borne on the clouds [Dan 7:13], and coming
> As a man to judge the kings and their empires.
> Ezekiel, too, sees Him on the high throne, [He Who] was also God,
> That likeness [*dmuta*, here obviously rendering *morphe*] of the servant
> that He assumed within the womb [of Mary]
> Was whispered on the wings of the heavenly beings (575:11–16).

The manifestation of the Son and Glory of God in human form signals the paradox and promise of the Incarnation, and, in Jacob's insistence on that paradox of the one Son, we can also discern a certain echo of the Christological controversy of the era. Our preacher is nothing if not insistent on the unity of God and man in Christ, as opposed to those — dyophysites like Nestorius and his ilk — who divide and «number» the one Son. The «appearance as a man» and, simultaneously, «as God in great splendor», is «the way», he tells us, «that was trodden by the Son of God, both divinely and humanly, though He is One» (576:12–13). Turning then to interpret the fire above and below the loins of the human figure in Ezekiel's vision (Ezk 1:27), Jacob asks:

> Why was it necessary for the prophet to repeat [the description of] the vision, then
> To say «above» and repeat [the same] about [what is] below in his prophecy?
> He wanted to show the higher and lower [aspects] of the Son of God,
> How that supernal Being had become earthly,

Pierre-Marie Guy, O.P. / Ed. P. de Clerck, E. Palazzo (Paris, 1990) 173–182, for Jacob's predecessors, and Boulos Song, La méthode exégetique de Jacques de Saroug… 73 ff., for Jacob himself. *Raza* is used for *both* the spiritual sense of the Old Testament *and* for the Church's sacraments. It is well to recall that for Jacob, as indeed for Origen and others of the Greek fathers, the scriptures enjoy a real, sacramental value. The holy words carry the presence of the Word, and hence *raza* for Jacob, as for Aphrahat and Ephrem, can and does apply equally as a term signifying Christ's presence in the Old Testament and that same presence in the consecrated waters of Baptism, and in the consecrated bread and wine of the Eucharist. In each case, the Christian is to discern the presence of Christ beneath the «veil» of the words, or indeed of the bread and wine. Relatedly, see thus also S. Brock (tr.), Jacob of Serug on the Veil of Moses // idem, Studies in Syriac Spirituality… 73–89.

> And that He had become a mediator [cf. I Tim 2:5], because He stood in the midst between the [two] sides [i.e., heaven and earth]
> In order to make peace [cf. Eph 2:14] between those and high and those below.
> Thus He girded himself with peace in the prophecy,
> For he [i.e., Ezekiel] saw something in the likeness of a [rain]bow in the clouds accompanying Him,
> A sign of the peace that He would come and make with those below.
> (576:18–577:4)

Here Jacob links the rainbow shown to Noah as sign of peace after the destruction of the Flood (Gen 9:11–16) with the rainbow shades of the theophany in Ezk 1:28. Both signal the peace, *shaina*, which the one Son wills to effect between the realms of heaven and earth, angels and human beings, and thus, more importantly, His overcoming of the estrangement between God and humanity that had resulted from the Fall:

> And that strife which the serpent had started among the trees [of Eden]
> He [the Son] will remove, and the quarrel will cease that had been inflamed.
> And the hidden Father and the great Adam, who were at enmity,
> Will be reconciled in the Son who stands as the mediator.

The whole Gospel of Christ, Jacob concludes, is thus depicted in the chariot vision (578:3–15).

D. *Kenosis* and the *Imago Dei* vs. Jewish (and Christian?) Mystical Anthropomorphism

1. Reconciling Prophets with Apostles: the Incarnation as Explanation of the Prophecy

The second half of the homily is devoted to the elaboration of this central point, often in fascinating and moving fashion. Space allows me only to touch on a few significant moments before moving on to Jacob's and then my own conclusions. The first is, again, another clear allusion to, and borrowing from, Phil. 2:6–7. «Look closely at Him now [on the chariot]», Jacob tells the prophet:

> ...Who is splendid in His great glory,
> And acknowledge that this is He when He has lowered Himself to poverty...
> With this type that you have been shown upon the chariot,
> The land sees His humility as He delivers it.
> By these faces, which He has now asked that you be shown,
> In them you will see Him when He has taken on a body in truth.
> To this condition your Lord came down when He emptied Himself,
> That the world might see Him in the form [*dmuta*] of a servant.
> This is He who shall come in the flesh, openly [or, manifestly],

That in Him the human race may be set free from slavery.
The revelation depicted the whole path of the Son of God,
And it taught Ezekiel the mystery [of the Incarnation] through that chariot. (583:3–18)

If it were not a revelation of the Incarnation, Jacob continues, then the prophet's vision would have been simply ignored and, even, inexplicable:

Our Lord manifested Himself in the world when He came to it,
And illumined the face of prophecy, with the result that everyone recognized it [i.e., prophecy, as true]...
For if God had not appeared as a man,
Ezekiel would not have been renowned for these riches,
And people would not have comprehended the scroll of his prophecy...
Yet now, because the Son of God came to the world,
Ezekiel is glorified who saw His mystery (584:3–4, 10–14).

Without the coming of Christ, the human figure on the chariot would have been cause for a genuine, theological scandal, and rightly criticized for giving shape to God who is infinite, without any limit or form:

And it would have been asked, «why did he see Him as a man
«Who, without any likeness, is glorious in the hiddeness of His high place?»
«What is this, that he saw the cherubim in great splendor,
«And yet [saw] the Lord of the cherubim as a man?
«This appearance is [too] small to be about God,
«That a throne should hold Him Whose Glory even the heavens do not contain». (585:2–7)[40]

I think that Jacob is also taking deliberate aim here at a contemporary, anthropomorphic interpretation not only of Ezekiel's vision, but of the God of the revelation, and we will see him addressing this issue quite openly in a moment. Right now, though, and with regard to the section of his homily under discussion here, I should like to underline a second reconciliation — or, rather, a harmony — that he wishes to establish, and that runs through his other works as well: the agreement of the Old Testament prophecy with the New Testament preaching of the Apostles, and, with that agreement, the justice of the Church's claim to the inheritance of Israel:

...because the prophecy depicted His [Christ's] type,
The apostleship also gave the truth of His body to the world.
It is proclaimed [both] by the prophecy and the apostleship
That He Who was, is He Who is embodied...
...while those younger in the Spirit [the Apostles] declared that He had become a man,

[40] Cf. Isa 66:1 and I Kings 8:27, together with my remarks below and n.42 on the *shi'ur qomah* tradition.

> The elders [i.e., the prophets], too, witnessed that they had seen Him as a man.
> From the testimony of prophecy and of the apostleship,
> Who is it who flees, except an enemy of the faith? (586:21–587:11)[41]

2. A Polemical Exchange with Jewish Anthropomorphism: The Incarnate Word as the True and Original Image of God

The phrase, «enemy of the faith», leads Jacob naturally — in his own mind, at least — to an interesting, polemical section addressed to an unnamed Jew, in which I think we catch allusions to the traditions attaching to the mystical vision of the body of God in rabbinic circles, the *shi'ur qomah*, or «measurement of the stature (of the divine body)», texts which are associated with the *merkavah* literature.[42] For Jacob, the interpretation of Ezekiel's vision in accordance this latter tradition is unacceptable for several reasons. By refusing to acknowedge Christ as the meaning of the prophet's Chariot, his Jewish opponent is led first of all into absurdities. The Father's transcendent «hiddeness» is compromised and reduced to human form:

> If you do not affirm that the Son of God became a man, [then] it was the hidden Father [that] Ezekiel saw on the chariot like a human being, if it was not the form of His Only [-Begotten] One...

This leads to a series of sarcastic questions about a literalist reading of the Chariot and its angels:

---

[41] See Jacob's *Homélies contre les juifs*, perhaps esp. Hom. 3, lines 15–118 (*PO* 38. 86–93) and 7, lines 201–370 (194–195). Cf. also his comparison, in our homily, of the OT and NT with the wheels of Ezekiel's chariot: «And the wheel, which is described as having been seen within the wheel, / [This is] the new Gospel within the Law which is full of mysteries. / The [one] Testament wished to reveal the [other] Testament / With the wheel and the wheel which were seen one within the other» (580:9–12). I seem to recall a similar use of Ezekiel's wheels by Maximus Confessor in the latter's *Mystagogy*.

[42] On the *shi'ur qomah* tradition in Judaism, see Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and the Talmudic Tradition… 36–42, and M. S. Cohen, The Shi'ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism (Latham—New York—London, 1983). Arguing for its presence in early Christianity, see J. Fossum, Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism // *VC* 37 (1983) 260–287; and G. G. Stroumsa, Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ // *HTR* 76.3 (1983) 269–288; and, recently, C. Gieschen, Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence (Leiden, 1998) Esp. 185 ff. For the lively continuation of this current in fourth- and fifth-century monastic literature, see A. Golitzin, «The Demons Suggest an Illusion of God's Glory in a Form»: Controversy over the Divine Body and Vision of Glory in Some Late Fourth-, Early Fifth-Century Monastic Literature // *StMon* (forthcoming).

> Well then, were the wheels joined at the axle in order to proceed,
> And were the wings really flying, as you are saying?
> And [was] the throne the prophet saw made of stone,
> And did the whole matter end [with the words] «on the throne like a man?»
> (588:7–589:2)

The last question, whether the prophet's vision was all about seeing a humanlike figure on the cherubic throne, is surely directed against the *merkavah* tradition, for whose Jewish adepts this was in fact the point and the goal of their proposed mystical ascent to heaven. Jacob instead insists that Ezekiel's chariot was — and is — not the end of the story. First of all, I think it clear that he is aware of this Jewish tradition, and, as is arguable from elswhere in his writings, that he is to some extent in actual conversation with contemporary Jews. His seven *Homilies against the Jews*, for example, display a broad knowledge of traditions current among them, and in one case feature what appears to be a direct appeal to, as it were, the «Jew in the street» over the heads of the latter's rabbinic teachers:

> The scribes of your people have hidden the reality from you; and your teachers have not openly spoken the truth.
> Consciously or unconsciously, they have hidden the reality, and they do not show from the texts [of Scripture] the image of the Son.
> Ask them!...
> Say, «O, Rabbi! Show me...
> O Jew! Ask these questions of your teachers.
> Ask, and see what they say about Jesus!
> Judaism [*yehoudayuta*] is full of lies![43]

Perhaps there were occasional, Jewish listeners who were drawn to hear the famous preacher, or, perhaps, this is rhetorical display for an exclusively Christian audience, though the latter explanation does not entirely persuade me. The appeal I just quoted seems quite immediate. In any case, and relative to my point about anthropomorphism, Jacob is, secondly, aware of this as both an exegetical option, and — in the case of the *merkavah* texts — as the

[43] «Judaism», *jehoudayuta*, appears to mean the rabbinic traditions enshrined in the Mishnah and Talmud, the «Oral Torah». See *Homélies contre les Juifs* 7, lines 205–309 (*PO* 38. 156–159), together with Albert's comments on this term, Ibid. 13. While we might — and doubtless should — recoil from his ferocity nowadays, Jacob does have a certain point here. The Rabbinic exaltation of the «Oral Torah» does seem, at least in part, to have been advanced with an eye to keeping Israel distinct from those among the «nations» who laid claim to the written Torah, i.e., the text of the OT, and then who said that they were true Israel. This certainly sounds like Christians. Thus see, for example, the sources quoted and discussed recently by H. K. Harrington, Holiness: Rabbinic Judaism and the Graeco-Roman World (London—New York, 2001) 139–142.

stated goal of mystical experience. At a couple of points in our homily he himself plays on the *shi'ur qomah* tradition, as in the lines: «Ezekiel saw the likeness [*dmuta*] on the chariot/ As a man [*a(i)k bar nasha*] higher than the summit of the heavens» (591:19–20).[44] The most striking instance and demonstration of his familiarity with the idea of the vast dimensions of the divine body, however, occurs in his prose homily on the Epiphany. Here he presents John the Baptist as having come to announce that «the Great Body [*gushma rabba*] has arrived to make itself visible», and to «infuse earnestly into her ears [i.e., of the Church as bride] the grandeur of the Lord [*rabbuta d-marya*] as well as his own [i.e., John's] smallness». Jacob concludes the relevant section of this homily with the following:

> ...he [the Baptist] wanted to show the bride the loftiness of the stature [*rawma d-qawmta*] of the Bridegroom while instructing her, and said, «The sandals of your Betrothed are exalted above my head. As I extend my hands, I am not able to reach their laces... the beauty of His stature [*shuphra d-qawmteh*] is well above my head... as the height is above the abyss, as heaven above the earth.[45]

The repetition here, which I take to be deliberate, of *qawmta*, the precise Syriac equivalent of the Hebrew *qomah*, is itself striking, and moreso the accompanying image of Christ's enormous size, with the Baptist shorter than the arch of the Lord's foot, a point which the former then underlines by declaring that the difference between their respective sizes is more absolute than even that startling comparison: Christ's hugeness is to John's littleness «as the height is above the abyss, as heaven is above the earth» (cf., perhaps, Isa 66:1?). Perhaps most telling of all is the setting of these passages within the language of bride and bridegroom, which I would read as at least a partial and, again, deliberate echo of the *Song of Songs*. If so, this would underline Jacob's conscious play on the Jewish literature of the *shi^{c}ur qomah*, since the latter tradition specifically linked the mystical vision of the divine body with the bride's enraptured description of the limbs of her beloved in *Song of Songs* 5:10–16.[46]

[44] Cf. my discussion below, and, for examples of an ancient Christian description of the height of the risen Christ as «overpassing the heavens», see the *Gospel of Peter* 10.40, in Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha… Vol. 1. 225, and cf. a similar passage regarding Christ at the Transfiguration in the apocryphal *Acts of John* 90; Ibid. Vol. 2. 180–181, together with Fossum's analysis of the latter in the light of Ex 33 and the *shi'ur qomah* tradition: Partes Posteriori Dei: The Transfiguration of Jesus in the Acts of John // idem, The Image of the Invisible God… 95–108.

[45] Kollamparampil, Jacob of Serug, *Select Festal Homilies*... 7, pp. 192–193. For the critical edition of the Syriac text, see Rilliet, Six homélies festales en prose // *PO* 43. 552, line 32; and 553, lines 13 and 16–21.

[46] See Cohen, The *Shi^{c}ur Qomah*: Liturgy and Theurgy… 99–123 on «the divine limbs», and note his suggested dating (51–70) of the present text entitled *Shi^{c}ur qomah* to the sixth century, which is to say, perhaps roughly contemporary with Jacob.

But if Jacob knows about these traditions, and is not above playing with them, he still insists on reading the appearance of the human form in Ezekiel's vision as a prophecy of the Son who is coming to be born of the Virgin:

> [It is] for this that the chariot came down to the earth,
> That through prophecy it might represent the descent of its Lord.
> And the glorious throne and blue of chastity that [Ezekiel] saw there
> [Is] the womb of Mary, which He [the Lord] kept closed in order to bear the Son of God.
> Also, that likeness which was seen upon the throne
> [Is] the Son of God who came in the flesh as a man. (589:15–18)

It is of some note, I think, that the blue of the prophet's sapphire throne, which is itself surely an echo of the blue of the pavement beneath the divine throne in the theophany of Ex 24:10, denotes Mary Theotokos. This might suggest the reason for the traditional color — blue — most often associated with her in Christian iconography. Certainly Jacob is himself quite clear that the whole «throne and seat upon the chariot...[is] an image of the Virgin Mother» (590:6–7),[47] and we might in our turn recall that «throne» and «chariot» (and even «mountain» — recalling the theophany at Sinai?) are, both of them, images of the Theotokos regularly deployed in Orthodox hymnography.[48]

It is this insistence on God *incarnate* which is the key to Jacob's argument with the Jew, and therewith to his adjustment of the *merkabah* and *shi*ᶜ*ur qomah* traditions. The divine body is certainly a reality, but it is the body of the Word made flesh, who is also, however, and precisely as incarnate, the prototype of Adam. Here we arrive at Jacob's subsequent reiteration of the theme of the *imago dei*. All the wonders of Ezekiel's chariot throne, he writes, including the fiery spirits in their strange and terrible forms, the «fire of burning» and the wheels of flame, the crystal and the sapphire, all the heavenly assemblies, are dominated by a human form. The Lord of the angels, Jacob points out, was seen by Ezekiel «as a man». Here, in lines which recall Irenaeus of Lyons centuries earlier, we find Jacob's statement that Adam was created in the likeness of the incarnate Word:

---

[47] Cf. Hansbury, Jacob of Serug on the Mother of God… 19–20 (the Theotokos as «chariot» and «palace»); 53–55 (as the «Ark» worshipped by Zechariah in the Temple and like the darkness of Sinai's cloud); 59–60 (again like the chariot and the cloud at Sinai); 74 (the Baptist dances in Elizabeth's womb like David before the Ark); and 80 (the Theotokos as greater than the chariot).

[48] The *Akathistos Hymn* is especially rich in this imagery. Likewise rich are, of course, the Marian feasts in the *Menaion*. See, for example, the *theotokion* following the *exapostolarion* of the matins for the Annunciation: «Hail Theotokos... holy Mother of God... living Bush [i.e., Ex 3]... lamp... throne... ladder and gate... divine chariot... swift cloud... temple... vessel of gold... mountain... tabernacle and temple...»; The Festal Menaion / Tr. Mother Mary, K. Ware (London, 1977) 459. Virtually all of Jacob's imagery is here.

Before creation the Father had drawn the image [*tsalma*]of His Son,
And depicted Him, and showed Him how He would shine forth on all the earth.
The Father gazed at the likeness [*dmuta*] of His Son, and molded Adam.
Since He was going to give [the Son] to the world, He delineated Him beforehand.
For this cause He said, «Let Us make man in Our image [*tsalma*, Gen 1:26]»,
In this same likeness [*dmuta*] in which Mary gave birth to the Only [-Begotten]One.
The Father willed to send Him into the world as a man,
And drew beforehand His form [*tsurta*], the Great Image [*tsalma rabba*], in Adam.
Ezekiel saw the likeness [*dmuta*] on the chariot
Like a human being, [seated] above the backs of the heavenly beings. (591:11–20)[49]

Here again we should note the play of the three central texts which I pointed to earlier as the core of the homily: Gen 1:26–27, Ezk 1:26–28, and Phil 2: 6–7, with the first two finding their explanation and coherence in the third, the proclamation of the self-emptying and Incarnation of the Son.

3. Visio dei*: The Glory and the Image — Polemic against an Archaic Christian Mysticism?*

I might add that, in view of what we saw above concerning the microcosmos and macrocosmos, anthropos and makranthropos, it makes a kind of humorous sense for Jacob to have remarked earlier on that the «Word sits on the throne [before Ezekiel] in order to get accustomed /To human dimensions» (577:17–18). While he is obviously toying in a playful way with the *shi'ur qomah* traditions, it is also true that the imagery of the Power as makranthropos, i.e., of the Word investing the cosmos like the soul in a human body, «downsizing», as it were, in order to be incarnate is both ancient and frequent, particularly among Syriac-speaking Christians. We find it, for example, in the *Odes of Solomon*, in Aphrahat and Ephrem, and in the Syrian-influenced *Macarian Homilies*.[50] It might well comprise the original force of

[49] Cf. B. M. Boulos Sony (tr.), Hymne sur la création de l'homme de l'Hexaemeron de Jacques de Saroug // *ParOr* 11 (1983) 167–200 (Syriac in *Homiliae selectae* 3.102–29), esp. 179–182 (Syriac 110–112) on the creation of Adam as a prefiguration of the Incarnate Word — and note Jacob's play on Gen 1:26, 2:7, and Phil 2:6 ff. in 179–180 (110). For Irenaeus, see Irenaeus of Lyons, *On the Apostolic Preaching* 11 / Tr. J. Behr (New York, 1997) 46–47.

[50] See, for example, the *Odes of Solomon* 7.3: «For in his kindness he has made his greatness small»; ed. and tr. J. H. Charlesworth (Chico, 1977) 35 (Syriac 33) — though note that I have been obliged to alter the translation as Charlesworth misses the

the *kenosis* passage of Phil 2:6–7 itself.[51] To be sure, Jacob, as a faithful — not to say emphatic — adherent of the Creed of Nicea-Constantinople and the *homoousion*, is obliged to understand the notion of «the Great One making himself small» in a metaphorical sense, not a literal one, but he is still just as clearly drawing on very old traditions of the *imago dei* in its relation to the divine Glory, the *kevod YHWH*.[52] Then, too, the notion that the Second Person particularly, as in the old Logos christology, is already in a sense vested with a body, that is, with the cosmos itself, lends extra force to the imagery here.

With regard to a «mythological», that is, literal reading of the divine body, I must add that I am not so sure that Jacob's debate is exclusively with Jewish exegesis and mysticism. I think, rather, that his remarks were also (or even primarily?) directed to some among his Christian audience who may well have been tempted by — or, more accurately, who had never abandoned and continued to affirm — an anthropomorphic understanding of the divine form, as well as a mysticism of ascent similar to the *merkavah* lore.[53] Criticism of anthropomorphism, perhaps especially in an ascetico-mystical context, together with the insistence on an interiorized reading of the ascent to heaven motif from apocalyptic literature, run together like a kind of crimson thread from the second and third centuries in Clement and Origen of Alexandria,

---

point, rendering *rabbuta* with «dreadfulness». See on this verse, and in contrast, Stroumsa, Form(s) of God… 283–284. In Aphrahat the play between «greatness» and «smallness» in reference to Christ's economy (and so to Phil 2:6 ff.) occurs frequently, e.g., in *Demonstration* 23.59, *PS* II, 121:9–14. Cf. also Ephrem, *Hymns on the Nativity* 4.186–188 // Ephrem the Syrian, *Hymns* / Tr. K. McVey (New York, 1989) 102; and Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies* 4.9–12 / Tr. G. Maloney (New York, 1992) 54–55; crit. ed. by H. Dörries, R. Klosterman, M. Kroeger (Berlin, 1964) 33–37. The latter is also discussed by Stroumsa, Form(s) of God…

[51] See again Stroumsa, Form(s) of God… 283; together with Quispel, Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis… 8–9; Fossum, Jewish-Christian Christology… 268–269; Segal, Paul the Convert… 59–62; idem, Paul's 'Soma Pneumatikon' and the Worship of Jesus // The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism / Ed. C. C. Newman (Leiden, 1999) 258–276, esp. 263; and Bockmuehl, The «Form of God»… 11–19.

[52] On the relationship between Gen 1:26–7 and the *kavod* of the OT theophanies, see J. Barr, Theophany and Anthropomorphism in the Old Testament // *VT Suppl.* 7 (Leiden, 1960) 31–38; and on the same linkage in the Rabbis, A. Goshen-Gottstein, The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature // *HTR* 87.2 (1994) 171–195.

[53] My friend and colleague at Marquette, M. R. Barnes, has recently suggested to me that Apollinaris' christology might have featured similar assumptions about the divine body of the Word, and pointed me to Gregory Nyssa's *Against Apollinarius*, taking issue esp. with the idea of a pre-existent «divine man» and «heavenly flesh». I look forward to Dr. Barnes' essay on this issue.

through such fourth-century, monastic writers as Evagrius Ponticus and the Macarian Homilist, and all the way to the fourteenth-century, Byzantine Hesychasts. I have touched on this polemical current in other articles,[54] so I shall not dwell on it here, save to note, first, that I find it impossible to believe that all this smoke does not point to some kind of fire. Second, we have only to glance at a couple of Jacob's immediate neighbors and contemporaries around the turn of the sixth century to see that he was not alone in his concerns. The Syrian mystic, Stephen bar Sudaili, presents us with a kind of curious, Christian variant of rabbinic-era, *hekhalot* mysticism, while the much better known body of writings, written under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, directly addresses the issues of both anthropomorphism and of ascent. Let it suffice me here to quote some phrases from the fourth chapter of Dionysius' famous little treatise, *The Mystical Theology*:

> The Cause of all... has neither a body [*soma*], nor shape [*schema*], nor form [*eidos*]... neither is He a place [*topos*], nor seen... nor perceived [by the senses]... nor is He troubled by material passions... nor is He in need of light... nor does He have, nor is He any of the things which are perceived by the senses.[55]

All four of the Greek terms that I have highlighted are at issue, given their Syriac equivalents (respectively: *gushma*, *eskhema*, *dmuta*/*tsurta*, and *atra*), in Jacob's homily. All four (or five) — body, form, likeness/shape, and place — are also arguably important from the time of the Second Temple apocalypses, and they are decidedly so in the *hekhalot* and *shi'ur qomah* texts. The association of God with light, also highlighted in my text from Dionysius, is like-

[54] See, e.g., Golitzin, «The Demons Suggest an Illusion of God's Glory in a Form»...; A. Golitzin, Temple and Throne of the Divine Glory: 'Pseudo'-Macarius and Purity of Heart // Purity of Heart in Early Ascetic and Monastic Literarture / Ed. H. A. Luckman, L. Kulzer (Collegeville, 1999) 107–129; and, specifically to the matter of the shift from an exterior to an interior appropriation of the Glory in Eastern Christian ascetical literature, A. Orlov, A. Golitzin, «Many Lamps are Lightened by the One»: Paradigms of the Transformational Vision in the Macarian Homilies // *VC* 55 (2001) 281–299.

[55] *Mystical Theology* 4 // *PG* 3. 1040D; crit. text: Corpus Dionysiacum II / Ed. G. Heil, A. M. Ritter (Berlin—New York, 1991) 148. For Stephen bar Sudaili, see F. S. Marsh, The Book which is called The Book of the Holy Hierotheos (London, 1927). On Stephen as advocating a form of pantheistic, though still ostensibly Christian *hekhalot* mysticism, see R. A. Arthur, A New Interpretation of the Context and Purpose of the Pseudo-Dionysian Corpus. (Unpub. D. Phil. dissertation, Kings College, University of London, 1998) 36–39, 54–79, and esp. 131–146. For Dionysius as replying to relatedly controverted issues involving the understanding of mysticism and liturgy among Christian ascetics, see A. Golitzin, Dionysius Areopagita: A Christian Mysticism? // *Pro Ecclesia* (forthcoming).

wise fundamental to the earliest biblical theophanies, and it carries right on being so in subsequent Jewish and Christian mystical writings.[56] So far as Jacob is concerned, however, the *merkavah* is not the last word in divinity. Rather, he insists to his listeners that it is of little or no consequence. God transcends the chariot which, as we saw above, is merely an act of divine condescension for the needs of the angels, the sanctuary of their (created) heavenly temple. But, as for the godhead itself, that «citadel of light» which is the «place» and being of the triune mystery, the «holy of holies» of the divine essence:

> There is no chariot there, either to ascend to, or to seek out,
> Nor are there wheels, nor creatures in their [different] kinds
> Where the Trinity dwells in great splendor. (601:1–3)[57]

Secondly, and specifically in reference to the matter of light and fire, Jacob recalls Dionysius' more famous apophaticism:

> The place is empty, for it is filled with divinity...
> And had [angelic]fire ascended to it, [that fire] would have been burnt up by His Breath...
> It is not for the spirits or luminaries to be surrounded by Him,
> And neither radiance nor honor enters to live with Him.
> Nor does the glory of anything created come nigh Him.
> The place is sublime...
> The Trinity transcends the word of everything that speaks,
> The divinity is in a place far from all inquirers,

[56] On light/fire in Jewish mysticism, see I. Chernus, Visions of God in Merkabah Mysticism // *JSJ* 13.1–2 (1982) 123–146; idem, Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism: Studies in the History of Midrash (Berlin—New York, 1982) Esp. 74–87 on «the splendor of the *Shekinah*»; C. R. A. Morray-Jones, Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkavah Tradition // *JJS* 43 (1992) 1–31; Goshen-Gottstein, The Body as Image of God... 178–183; W. F. Smelik, On the Mystical Transformation of the Righteous into Light // *JSJ* 27.2 (1995) 122–144, esp. 131–143. For a still useful selection of light passages from Eastern Christian monastic literature, though totally without sensitivity to their Jewish resonances (identifying them rather as «Neoplatonist» in origin), see H. V. Beyer, Die Lichtlehre der Mönche des vierzehnten und des vierten Jahrhunderts, erörtet am Beispiel des Gregorios Sinaïtes, des Evagrios Pontikos, and des Ps-Makarios/Symeon // *JÖB* 31.1 (1980) 169–196.

[57] See also Jacob's homily, «On the Ascension», in Kollamparampil, Jacob of Serug, *Select Festal Homilies*... 348–352, especially Christ's ascent above all the angelic orders to «the exalted place» (348, line 380), the «holy of holies» (349, lines 409–410), «the tabernacle of the Father» (350, lines 433–434), and «the hidden place» (351, line 445). For the related expressions: «the brightness of the godhead», «the citadel of the light of his being», and «that place [*haw atra*]», see his homily «On the Establishment of Creation»; Trigg, Biblical Interpretation... 187.

The Father begetting and the Son begotten and the living Spirit:
The Being Whose place no one knows, save He alone. (601:9–602:5)[58]

Thus, a few pages later, we find an express prohibition directed against a mysticism of ascent to the divine chariot: «O Sinner! In your seeking, do not look for Him on high!» (606:3). The prohibition against making a heavenly journey suggests to me that some of Jacob's audience were interested in doing just that.

E. The «Place» of our Encounter with God: the Altar of the Church

A last highlight, before we move to my concluding remarks, concerns the «place» where Christians ought to be looking to encounter the splendor of divinity. This is, again, Jacob's subtext, and as well a reprise of the theme of a linkage between heavenly and earthly liturgies, of the mutual reflection of the celestial and terrestrial temples, that we saw him sketch in his initial explanation of the prophet's vision. In a wonderful passage, he takes up Ezk. 10, with its image of the «angel in white linen» approaching the chariot in order to receive coals of fire from the hand beneath the throne, which the angel then scatters over Jerusalem as a sign of the judgement ordained for the city. This picture, Jacob tells us, is a type of the Eucharist (and note the reference he works in to the temple vision in Isaiah 6:1–6):

The Son of God is all the beauty of prophecy,
And without Him there is neither prophecy nor revelation.
In the coals of fire are depicted the pearls of His body,
And in the chariot [is a portrait of] the holy altar of divinity...
These coals of fire that are in the chariot depict His body.
They were placed in it both for retribution and for forgiveness.

[58] On the significance of the term, «place», in the scriptures as denoting the *locus dei*, and specifically associated generally with theophany and with the tabernacle/temple in particular, see the articles by H. Ringgren, *maqom* // TDOT. Vol. 8. 532–548; and H. Köster, *topos* // TDNT. Vol. 8. 187–208. On the deployment in Rabbinic thought of *maqom* as divine name, denoting God's omnipresence and on occasion overlapping with *shekinah*, see E. E. Urbach, The Sages: Their Concepts and their Beliefs / Tr. I. Abrahams (Cambridge, MA, 1995) 66–79. For its importance in the *Gospel of Thomas* as a virtual synonym for Christ and the divine light, see DeConick, Seek to See Him... 65–73, esp. 70–71, and relatedly 99–122. See also C. Stewart, Imageless Prayer and the Theological Vision of Evagrius Ponticus // *JECS* 9.2 (2001) 173–204, for a sensitive exploration of the meaning of *topos* in Evagrius' mystical theology, though Steward does not touch on the wider and older resonances of the word save for noting some of the key scriptural *loci*. That Evagrius was aware of these wider reverberations, however, including their echoes of temple traditions, seems clear from the short but very valuable article by N. Séd, «La shekinta et ses amis araméans // *COr* 20 (1988) 233–242. The topic merits an extended study.

One [of them] was given to Isaiah, to forgive his iniquity,
And [others] were scattered in Jerusalem for punishment.

The liturgy of heaven and the worship of the Church are therefore one and the same:

Within the Chariot [were] holy coals of fire,
In the holy altar [are] precious pearls.
On the altar is the body, and on the chariot fire abides,
Since both above [in heaven] and below [on earth] there is a single mystery [or, perhaps, sacrament] of the Only [-Begotten] One. (596:2–14)[59]

The angel himself is «a type of the [Christian] priest clothed with the form [*tsurta*] of the Son of God», while the hand beneath the chariot is an image of the Holy Spirit. It is the Latter Who is the agent of the Eucharistic change, as Jacob makes clear in an extended passage on the meaning of the consecratory *epiklesis*:

It is not the [human] priest who has authority to sacrifice the Only [-Begotten] One,
And to lift Him up before His Father as a sacrifice for sinners.
Rather, the Holy Spirit comes forth from the Father,
And descending, He overshadows [*shra*] and dwells [*shken*] within the bread, and makes it the Body...
And the Spirit Who is within stretches out to the priest who is outside,
Like the cherub stretched out to the man who was in white linen,
And [the priest] takes from Him the propitiatory fire in the hollow of his hand,
And, taking it out, he gives flowing wealth to all the world. (597:5–18)[60]

At this point, Jacob moves on to link together the worship of both the Old and the New Covenants with that of heaven. He rightly notes the expressly sacerdotal imagery of Ezekiel's angel in white linen:

The priests of the People [i.e., Israel] were clothed in [white] linen within the Holy of Holies [cf. Lev 16:2–14, the liturgy of *Yom Kippur*],
Just as the angel at the chariot was clothed in [white] linen.
It was not the angel who took his cue from the priest who was clothed,
But rather [it was] the priest who was made like that angel.

[59] On «Fire» as one of Jacob's favorite words for the Word, see Brock, Baptismal Themes… 334–336. «Fire» is likewise one of the Rabbis' favorite expressions for the word of revelation, so cf. Harrington, Holiness… 132–133 and 155–156.

[60] Recall Jacob's use of *shekinta* as denoting the Second Person (above, n.32), and note here his use of the same root, *škn*, in verbal form, for the action of the Spirit at the Eucharistic *epiklesis*. Thus the Spirit's *coming to dwell* (*shken*) in the Gifts makes present *the dwelling* (*shekinta*) among us of Christ, the Immanuel.

Which is to say, that the Old Covenant Tabernacle and Temple were also an image of heaven. Thus Jacob continues with a reference to Exodus 25:9 ff., that is, to God's revelation on Sinai of the heavenly «pattern» (in Hebrew, *tabnit*, and in the *Peshitta* — again! — *dmuta*) of worship:

> Moses saw the whole form [*tsurta*] of these mysteries,
> And he came down [from Sinai] to trace it in the tabernacle and its furnishings.
> And, just as Moses saw, so Ezekiel saw [them] as well...
> The mystery of the Church was prior to both Moses and Ezekiel,
> And on it the angels, too, longed to gaze. (598:18–599:8)

Our preacher depends here on a tradition that was already old by the time of Christ, which is that, at the time of the revelation on Sinai, Moses was accorded a vision of — or, in some accounts, an actual ascent to — heaven where he was shown the celestial temple and liturgy.[61] Likewise, the reference here to the Church as antedating both Ezekiel and Moses is, first of all, dependent on another, related tradition: that Paradise was designed as a temple, and that Adam's original calling was to be priest. We find the idea implicitly in the accounts of the Hebrew scriptures themselves in the relationship obtaining between Genesis, Exodus (on the making of the tabernacle), and I Kings (the design and consecration of Solomon's temple). The idea then becomes explicit as early as *Jubilees* in the second century B.C., and it is quite prominent in Jacob's own beloved Ephrem, particularly in the latter's *Hymns on Paradise*.[62] As Jacob himself puts it in another homily:

> God made the gift of priesthood to men
> In order that they might be consecrated by means of it.
> In His love for peace [*shaina*], He bestowed this gift on them

[61] On Moses' ascent to heaven, see the materials assembled by W. A. Meeks in the latter's The Prophet King: Moses Traditions and Johannine Christology (Leiden, 1967) 122–125 (Philo), 140–142 (Josephus), 156–159 (the OT Pseudepigrapha), 205–211 (Rabbinic midrash), and 241–246 (Samaritan traditions).

[62] On the linkage between the Temple and the creation stories of Gen 1–2 (including Eden), see M. Weinbaum, Sabbath, Temple, and the Enthronement of the Lord: The Problem of the *Sitz im Leben* of Genesis 1:1–2:3 // Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles / Ed. A. Caquot, M. Delcor (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1981) 501–512; Levenson, Sinai and Zion... 111–184; and esp. Barker, The Gate of Heaven..., particularly her chapter on «The Garden», 57–103. For Ephrem (also cited at the close of Barker's chapter), see St Ephrem of Syria, *Hymns on Paradise* / Trans. S. Brock (New York, 1990) Esp. 3.7–16 and 14.7–12, pp. 93–96 and 184–186. Syriac text in Sancti Ephraem Syri in Genesim et in Exodum Commentarii / Ed. R.-M. Tonneau (CSCO, 174) 10–12 and 60–61. See also Brock's helpful sketch of the traditions Ephrem is working with in the former's «Introduction», *Hymns on Paradise*, esp. 49–74.

And exalted them, so that they might offer Him their sacrifices.
In order to mingle them with Himself in His glory [*shubha*] and majesty [*rabbuta*],
He established them in His spiritual ministry [*teshmeshta*].[63]

The imagery of «mingling» is typical of Syriac-speaking Christians from the earliest texts we have in that language, and here it obviously denotes what the Greek Fathers refer to as deification, *theosis*, the gift of participation in God's uncreated glory. Adam did not fulfill this vocation. He did not make «peace», *shaina*, but Christ, as we have seen Jacob emphasize, did: «This deed our Lord came down and accomplished on the earth».[64] Paradise, Sinai and Temple, heaven and the Church's worship, are all of them joined in Christ, who thus is the bond between both the beginning and the end, and between those on high and those below. I think it also worth noting that we find several of the terms I have dwelt on, particularly in the preceding section on mystical ascent and anthropomorphism, repeated here in reference to the liturgy of heaven and earth: body, form, likeness, and place. This is not accidental. The true «body of God» is here, on the altar. The «form of God» — i.e., the incarnate Word — is depicted in the celebrating priest; who reveals, together with the rest of us in solemn assembly, the «likeness» of heaven, and so the «place» of the divine rest.[65]

Thus we arrive at the force of Jacob's concluding remarks. He follows his prohibition against heavenly ascent, which I cited at the close of the last section, with the following affirmation:

[63] M. Albert, Mimro inédit de Jacques de Saroug sur le sacerdoce et l'autel // *ParOr* 10 (1981/2) 51–77; here 55, lines 2–6. I am translating quite unashamedly from Albert's French, with one exception. In line 5, she renders the Syriac *d-nhlwt 'nwn bh* with «Afin de se les associer». I have changed her «to associate» into the more literal «to mingle». On «mingling» as a key term in Syriac Christian discourse, particularly as conveying the sense of the Greek *theosis*, see C. Stewart, «Working the Earth of the Heart»: The Messalian Controversy in History, Texts, and Language to A.D. 431 (Oxford—New York, 1991) 171–203; and, more briefly, on the same language in Isaac of Nineveh, cf. also Alfeyev, The Spiritual World of Isaac of Nineveh… 56–58.

[64] On Christ's priesthood elsewhere in Jacob, see again the passages from his homily «On the Ascension» cited above, n. 57, where Christ's ascent is presented as the triumphal entry of the High Priest into the Holy of Holies. Cf. also the Albert, Mimro inédit sur le sacerdoce… 59–64, together with J. Thekeparampil (tr.), Jacob of Serug's Homily on Malkizedeq // *The Harp* 6.1 (1993) 53–64, esp. 55 ff.

[65] I would read this as very similar — even identical in intent (if not in its lexicon) — to Dionysius Areopagites' opening lines in *Celestial Hierarchy* 1.3 (121C–124A; Heil, Ritter 8:14–9:15) on the liturgy of heaven as mirrored in that of earth, together with his definition of hierarchy in 3.1–2 (164D–165A; Heil, Ritter 17:10–18:6) as intended to shape its members, both collectively and severally, into «the form of God» (*to theoeides*).

> He has come to you, to your place. Look at Him! for He is with you
> At the altar as [at] a meeting-place with you, so that you may see Him as He rests upon the table,
> And from the particles of His body all creation is satisfied. (606:4–7)

This is why we are not to go looking for a way to climb up to heaven, nor be jealous of the angels' service of the *merkavah*. If anything, Jacob suggests, they should jealous of us! The Presence, the *shekinah*, is right here:

> All the wealth of the heavenly beings has descended to the earth
> In Immanuel, Who is [both] with us, and is our God.
> The hidden altar, which is ministered to in mystery —
> Look! [It] is revealed, and is [lit. «stands»] among earthly angels [i.e, us]...
> Look! in the ministry of the holy altar, at the time of the Mysteries,
> Are marshalled the [heavenly] powers, standing with their cries of «Holy».

We lack nothing that the angels have. «If», Jacob adds, «the eye of our soul were as limpid as the prophet's», we would be able see «the shining throng of their hovering» (607:13–608:3). Indeed:

> All the mysteries that were hidden among the angels
> Come to pass in her [i.e., the Church], and it is she who is the schoolmistress of the heavenly beings. (609:7–8)

There is therefore a greater thing among us now than Ezekiel's chariot throne. If in heaven the cherubim «bear Him upon their backs with wonder», in the Church on earth we may «hold Him fast in the hollows» of our hands (609:13–14).

III. Some Concluding Thoughts and Observations: A Call to Biblical Theology?

There is more that I could say, including the lovely symmetry of the piece, beginning as it does with the «Exalted One on the unsearchable chariot», and concluding with the mystery of «the Crucified One in whom all the mysteries are accomplished», in which juxtaposition we might discern an echo of I Cor 2:8; or Jacob's remarks on the «Virgin Church», backed by the wealth of an ecclesial imagery with profound roots in the scriptures and tradition; or the matter of his intriguing allusions to the «inner place» where the Christian intellect is to fasten its attentions, phrases at the least suggestive of a spiritual tradition that we meet in Aphrahat, the *Liber Graduum*, and the *Macarian Homilies* — but all these riches must await another day. There is enough in what I have said, I think, for me to say now that his characterization as somehow strange and aberrant, a fringe person, could not be further from the truth. In this homily, which matches up very comfortably with his other works, he is lending expression to the common faith of the Church, and he does so by

drawing on traditions that antedate Christianity and extend back, through the New Testament writers, into the inheritance of biblical and immediately post-biblical Israel. He is entirely — or anyhow next to entirely — Semitic in his diction, and in fact very close indeed to the Rabbis with whom he quarrels.

In this latter respect, by bringing our attention back to the truth that our Lord insisted on to the Samaritan woman, that «Salvation is of the Jews», I think that Jacob can serve us today in a kind of double capacity. First of all, he should remind us that all that extraordinary panoply of polysyllabic Greek abstractions which we meet in the Greek Fathers, and which modern Orthodox theologians — God bless them! — are so anxious to invoke, often to the utter confusion or at least misperception of their Western Christian interlocutors, has its roots in, and was deployed in order to serve and protect, a fundamentally biblical and, yes, Jewish-based understanding of the redemption and salvation offered by Jesus Messiah. In short, Jacob and his fellow Syrians, from Aphrahat and Ephrem to Isaac of Nineveh — and even Dionysius the Areopagite, whom I have referred to a couple of times — help to demonstrate that our roots as Orthodox are planted firmly in the land of Israel.

This demonstration and reminder, secondly, should direct us — by whom I mean Orthodox believers in general and, specifically, those of us who claim to be doing Orthodox theology — to our biblical roots, which we will find readily enough to hand in the wealth of our liturgical texts which so often resonate to the same beat and almost as often to the very same imagery as moves Jacob, while much the same can be said of the literature of our spiritual writers. I should think that, for Orthodox in the United States, surrounded by a Protestant theological culture that insists on scriptural demonstration, such a biblical recourse would be obvious, but all too often it is not, and again all too often we find ourselves embarrassed by accusations that, for example, the doctrine of deification, or the teaching of the liturgy as in the likeness of heaven, or the emphasis on light and transfiguration, or the theology of the icon[66] are «Neoplatonist» in origin (an assertion that still serves,

[66] I would not deny the utility and importance of late Greek philosophy for the iconodules' defense of the images, but what often gets overlooked — aside, of course, from their obvious invocation of the Incarnation — is the resonance in their writings of very old, biblical themes around, exactly, the same notes of image/form and glory that we have been dealing with in this essay. Thus John of Damascus counters the very aniconic thrust of the Deuteronomist («You saw no form in the fire», Dt 4:12) with what is, effectively, an appeal to the Glory and image traditions of the Priestly source as they appear in Phil 2:6 ff. (and see above, nn. 21, 42, and 51–52). See B. Kotter (ed.), Die Schriften des Ioannes von Damaskos (Berlin, 1973) Vol. 3. 78–83; ET: D. Anderson, St John of Damascus on the Divine Images (New York, 1980) 16–18. One might even read the eighth- and ninth-century debate as testifying to a certain continuity of tension in the «Israel of God», i.e., between the theologies of the «Name» and «Glory», and thus cf. Levenson's offhand remarks on this continuity,

alas! as a kind of «default setting» in much too much contemporary analysis of patristic spirituality and mysticism), and we hasten to make clumsy apologies or, worse, indulge ourselves in a theology of reaction. Jacob, and the revolutionary developments in recent scholarship that have helped me present him in this essay, makes it very, very clear that we have no reason to apologize to our Protestant brethren, but rather that we are ourselves in a position, speaking from within Holy Tradition, to criticize and improve biblical scholarship itself. We have no need to fear, and every reason to speak and write boldly. This confidence in the Tradition as providing a true reading, as indeed the necessary starting-point and «place» for the reading of the scriptures and subsequent theology, is the point that the great twentieth-century advocates of patristic renewal, such as Fr. Georges Florovsky, or Vladimir Lossky, or the late Fr. John Meyendorff (to recall merely the theologians of the Russian emigration, especially the last, who was my own first and much-beloved instructor), were so anxious to press and apply. The tools available to us now, particularly for biblical studies and for the transition from the Second Temple to the New Testament and the Fathers, which is to say, for the very matrix of Christianity itself, are much better than those luminaries had available to them. Let Jacob and his fellows be a kind of summons to us to carry on the work, and to fill up the weaknesses (chiefly biblical), of that earlier generation.

By way of a last word, allow me to turn back to that matter of «mythology» that so troubled Professor Bondi. I argue that she got things wrong in Jacob because she depended on a now outdated scholarly construct, one which imported more into the ancients it sought to elucidate than it drew from them, and which in consequence obfuscated more than it illumined. There is still, however, the fact that Rudolf Bultmann, for example, availed himself of this

---

i.e., regarding Byzantine icons and temple traditions, in Sinai and Zion… 151. I cannot resist referring to a couple of passages I came across in reading the *synaxarion* for the Sunday of Orthodoxy. The voice of God comes to a revered ascetic and orders him to honor «the image of my form», and cf. thus the Empress Theodora's dream vision of the «man with a supernatural countenance» who speaks to her as God; in The Synaxarion of the Lenten Triodion and Pentecostarion / Eds. D. Kidd, G. Ursache (Rives Junction, MI, 1999) 63–65. The Gospel pericope for the day, esp. Jn 1:51, also looks to ancient traditions around the Form and Glory. On the verse, see thus C. Rowland, John 1:51, Jewish Apocalyptic, and Targumic Traditions // *NTS* 30.3 (1984) 498–507, who argues that John is deploying a tradition attested in the Palestinian Targumim. The latter interpret the «descent» and «ascent» of the angels in Gen 28:12 as the heavenly beings first coming down to look at Jacob sleeping, then, on recognizing his face, going back to heaven to find his face, again, on the divine throne. Whether or not the first-century Evangelist knew this tradition, it seems clear to me that someone in mid-ninth century Constantinople knew of it, and so decided that this particular story was peculiarly apt for marking the restoration of, precisely, the veneration of the divine «Face».

method in part — or mostly — because he sought ultimately to liberate the Christian Gospel, as he understood the latter, from what he deemed an impossibly archaic, mythical worldview, and that he believed he had found in Heideggerian existentialism the key to a preaching more relevant to «modern man». I admit that his concern is still relevant, at least in certain instances. I have merely argued that Jacob's «mythology» is no more nor less than traditional Christianity, and that he was not the least bit interested in translating those already age-old symbols and images into the abstractions of contemporary Greek philosophy. In his role as preacher, I think that he was largely correct, and I would further maintain that the old, essentially biblical language and imagery he deployed *still* work for congregations, are still powerful and moving exactly because they are so deeply grounded in the language of the revelation made once for all to Israel, and because they resonate in harmony with the Orthodox liturgy, including the latter's iconography, hymnography, and even the architecture of an Orthodox church — all of which, of course, are built on pretty much the very same foundations as Jacob's preaching. This is not to say, however, that there is no place for philosophical theology, but merely that the latter does not really belong in a sermon — unless the latter's hearers have very special needs, as can happen. In that respect, I think Bultmann's concern for «modern man» misplaced or, perhaps better, a bit confused. If by that phrase we mean «modernity», i.e., the philosophies and worldview of the Enlightenment and thereafter, then certainly there is a need for apologetics, and so for the exploitation of whatever resources are available to us in the realms of abstract thought. Here is the place for the recent arguments of, say, a Paul Valliere or a Fr. Michael Meerson, and their eloquent appeals to the wealth of Russian philosophical theology.[67] If, on the other hand, we mean by «modern man» the contemporary believer, then I am less convinced of any pressing need to depart in basic ways from Jacob's idiom. He speaks essentially *ad intra*, within the Church, and it is her own cherished and aboriginal diction which he deploys. I would add that I think that his diction might well work for *any* Christian who is thoroughly versed in the Bible, such as many of our Protestant Evangelical compatriots. What it does not, cannot, and was never intended to do is to provide a ready-made entré into the universe of biblical (and so liturgical) symbols for the person who is completely unfamiliar with that world. For such a person catechetics, instruction, and, to be sure, apologetics are required. It is also true that many

[67] See P. Valliere, Modern Russian Theology: Bukharev, Soloviev, Bulgakov. Orthodox Theology in a New Key (Grand Rapids, 2000); M. Meerson, The Trinity of Love in Modern Russian Theology (Quincy, IL, 1998). The latter is very interesting in its account of the nineteenth and twentieth century, Russian appropriation of both Augustine's «psychological model» of the Trinity and of its expression in, especially, Richard of St Victor.

of us who are believers also require, for ourselves, some philosophical rationale that engages the questions of the present age. Jacob, however, speaks wholly to and within the heart of the Christian mystery and the Church's life. This is at once his glory and his limitation. There is no need to slight the former when pointing out the latter. He has his place, and our brothers and sisters in the Syrian (Jacobite) Orthodox and Maronite Churches are right to celebrate him as, together with his beloved Ephrem, the great singer of the Faith.

ABSTRACT

Jacob of Serug († 521) is, after Ephrem of Nisibis, the most beloved of theologian poets among the Syriac-speaking Christians of the East. Until recently, though, he was not well known in Western Christian circles and, when discussed at all, was usually associated with Severus of Antioch and Philoxenus of Mabbug as part of a triad of the most important, early sixth-century «Monophysites» theologians. This article seeks rather to examine one of Jacob's works, the long verse homily on Ezekiel's chariot vision, against the background of those traditions common in particular to Eastern Christianity and looking to their origins in the Judaism of the Second Temple. The homily conjoins three biblical texts: Genesis 1:26; Ezekiel 1:26, 28; and Phillipians 2:6. Its point is simple and fully in accord with, especially, pre-Nicene Christianity: the one who appeared to Moses and the prophets is the same one who was born of Mary Theotokos. While making this point, however, Jacob draws on — and occasionally opposes and criticizes — originally Second Temple Jewish traditions around the figure of Adam, mystical ascent to the divine throne, and the object of that ascent, the vision of the glorious form of God. He is thus a witness to the currency of these traditions in Christian circles, perhaps especially among the monks. His answer is the Eucharist. In the divine liturgy, he argues, everything that the prophet saw is present, and the one whom the ancients longed to go up to heaven to see, the one who rides on the throne of the cherubim, is present to the Christian in the bread and wine of communion.

Andrei Orlov
Alexander Golitzin
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

«MANY LAMPS ARE LIGHTENED FROM THE ONE»: PARADIGMS OF THE TRANSFORMATIONAL VISION IN THE MACARIAN HOMILIES

Among mystical testimonies circulating in the Eastern Christian tradition, two portentous descriptions of transformational visions can be found.

The first account is drawn from *2 Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse, apparently written in the first century CE and preserved in the Eastern Christian environment in its Slavonic translation. In this text the antediluvian patriarch Enoch describes his luminous metamorphosis near the Throne of Glory:

> And Michael, the Lord's greatest archangel, lifted me up and brought me in front of the face of the Lord... And Michael extracted me from my clothes. He anointed me with the delightful oil; and the appearance of that oil is greater than the greatest light, its ointment is like sweet dew, and its fragrance like myrrh; and its shining is like the sun. And I gazed at all of myself, and I had become like one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference.[1]

The second account is written a thousand years later and comes from the *Philokalia,* a collection of Eastern Christian writings compiled by Nicodemus Hagioretes, in which Pseudo-Symeon conveys preparatory instructions for acquiring the vision of the Taboric light:

> Then sit down in a quite cell, in a corner by yourself, and do what I tell you. Close the door, and withdraw your intellect from everything worthless and transient. Rest your beard on your chest, and focus your physical gaze, together with the whole of your intellect, upon the centre of your belly or your navel. Restrain the drawing-in of breath through your nostrils, so as not to breathe easily, and search inside yourself with your intellect so as to find the place of the heart, where all the powers of the soul reside. To start with, you will find there darkness and an impenetrable density. Later, when you persist and practice this task day and night, you will find, as though miraculously, an unceasing joy. For as soon as the intellect attains the place of the heart, at once it sees things of which it

[1] *2 Enoch* 22:6–10. F. I. Andersen, 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 139.

> previously knew nothing. It sees the open space within the heart and it beholds itself entirely luminous and full of discrimination.[2]

It is apparent that these two descriptions belong to very different symbolic worlds. In the first one, an adept, on his celestial trip, finds himself before the glorious appearance of the Lord, accompanied by the angels who extract the visitor from his earthly garments and anoint him with delightful oil. In the second one, he is led through darkness and «an impenetrable density» on the inner journey to the depth of his heart. The majesty of the celestial environment strikingly confronts the monotonous quietness of the inner contemplation. Still, something similar is recognizable in these two accounts. In both descriptions the visionaries eventually come to the same result — they behold themselves luminescent. Both accounts also stress the totality of this metamorphosis — mystical adepts of these visions become «entirely» luminous. It is, however, observable that in the two accounts the source of the divine light is different. In the first account, it comes from outside, namely from the glorious appearance of the Lord, depicted symbolically as the angelic anointing with shining oil. The shining oil, the «covering» substance of the transformation, serves as an additional detail which stresses the outer nature of the visionary's luminous metamorphosis.

The important feature of the second account which differentiates it from the first is the «inner» nature of the luminous metamorphosis — the illumination comes from inside, from the darkness of the soul, proceeding from the open space within the heart of the visionary.

Separated by a millennium, these two accounts serve as significant markers of the long-lasting theological journey from the outer transformational vision to its inner counterpart. On this journey the towering figure of the Syrian father, known to us as Pseudo-Macarius, remains prominent. The purpose of this article is to explore some of his concepts which in our opinion play a formative role in the transition from outer to inner in the transformational visions of Eastern Christian tradition.

The Background: Transformational Vision of the *Kavod*

In order to clarify the differences between the two transformational visions mentioned earlier, we must return now to the initial theological contexts which lie behind these two accounts.

The origin of the *Kavod* paradigm, which is formative for the vision in the Slavonic apocalypse, can be traced to Old Testament materials where one can find various polemics for and against the anthropomorphic understand-

[2] Pseudo-Simeon, The Three Methods of Prayer // *The Philokalia*. 5 vols / Tr. G. E. H. Palmer, P. Sherrard, K. Ware (London, 1995) Vol. 4. 72–73.

ing of God.[3] Weinfeld observes that the imagery of the enthroned divine glory known to us as the Lord's *Kavod* was «crystallized» in the Priestly and Ezekielian traditions.[4]

Theological developments of the Priestly tradition demonstrate that the anthropomorphism of the Priestly source is intimately connected with the place of Divine habitation.[5] In this tradition, «in which the Divinity is personalized and depicted in the most tangible corporeal similitudes», God, who possesses a human form, has a need for a house or tabernacle. [6]

Weinfeld rightly observes that this anthropomorphic position was not entirely an invention of the Priestly source[7] but derived from early sacral conceptions.[8] In these traditions the Deity was sitting in his house ensconced between the two cherubim, and at his feet rests the ark,[9] his footstool.[10]

[3] On the issue of Old Testament's anthropomorphism see: J. Barr, Theophany and Anthropomorphism in the Old Testament // *VT Suppl.* 7 (1960) 31–38; J. Hempel, Die Grenzen des Anthropomorphismus Jahwes im Alten Testament // *ZAW* 57 (1939) 75–85; F. Michaeli, Dieu à l'image de l'homme: Étude de la notion anthropomorphique de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament (Neuchâtel, 1950); W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament. 2 vols (Philadelphia, 1961) Vol. 1. 210–220; M. C. A. Korpel, A Rift in the Clouds. Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine (Münster, 1990) (UBL, 8) 87–590; T. N. D. Mettinger, The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies (Lund, 1982) (ConBOT, 18); M. Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School (Oxford, 1972) 191–209. On later Jewish anthropomorphism see: M. Fishbane, The «Measures» of God's Glory in the Ancient Midrash // I. Gruenwald *et al.* (eds.), Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity. Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday (Tübingen, 1992) 53–74; A. Marmorstein, The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God: Essays in Anthropomorphism (New York, 1937).

[4] M. Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School (Oxford, 1972) 191.

[5] T. N. D. Mettinger, The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies (Lund, 1982) (ConBOT, 18) 24.

[6] Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School… 191.

[7] For the roots of the theology of the priestly tabernacle see: Mettinger, The Dethronement of Sabaoth… 81–83.

[8] Weinfeld shows that «the notion of God sitting enthroned upon the cherubim was prevalent in ancient Israel (1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; Ps 80:2; 2 Kgs 19:15)». Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School… 192.

[9] Mettinger stresses that «the most important aspect of the Ark in Solomon's Temple was that it served as the footstool of God». Mettinger, The Dethronement of Sabaoth… 87.

[10] M. Haran, The Ark and the Cherubim // *IEJ* 9 (1959) 30–38.

This motif of the enthroned Deity becomes a central image in the book of Ezekiel, whose *Kavod*[11] theology is similar[12] to the Priestly doctrine.[13] Mettinger observes that «in Ezekiel, the *Kavod*-conception proved to represent an earlier phase than that discovered in the P-materials».[14] He further stresses that the iconography of Ezekiel is closely connected with the idea of God's royal presence in his sanctuary.[15] This connection of the *Kevod YHWH* with the enthroned God can scarcely be divorced from its previously established usage in early royal contexts.[16]

Weinfeld notes that Ezekiel's persistent tendency to describe God's *Kavod* as a brilliant and radiant fire encased in a cloud is also a distinct characteristic of the Priestly writings.[17] He argues that in the Priestly and Ezekielian writings the fire and cloud are inseparable elements of the apparition of God's Glory, where the cloud is the divine envelope which screens the Deity from mortal view.[18] In later Jewish and Christian traditions the radiant luminosity emitted by various celestial beings fulfills the same function, protecting against the direct vision of their true forms. In the Hebrew Bible, as well as in later apocalyptic traditions, God's «form» remains hidden behind His

[11] The term *Kavod* (Heb. כבוד) occurs 199 times in the Old Testament (24 occurences in the Pentateuch, 7 in the Deuteronomistic history, 18 in the Chronicler's history, 38 in Isaiah, 19 in Ezekiel, occasionaly in Jeremiah and the Minor Prophets, 51 occurences in the Psalms and 16 in Proverbs). The term כבוד can be translated as «substance», «body», «mass», «power», «might», «honor», «glory», «splendor». In its meaning as «glory» *Kavod* usually refers to God, his sanctuary, his city, or sacred paraphernalia. The Priestly tradition uses the term in connection with God's appearences in the tabernacle. P and Ezekiel describe *Kavod* as a blazing fire surrounded by radiance and a great cloud. M. Weinfeld, כבוד // TDOT. Vol. 7. 22–38.

[12] It is also noteworthy that Ezekiel and the materials of the Priestly tradition, such as Gen 5:1, share similar terminology, namely the term דמות. The term דמות appears 12 times in the Book of Ezekiel where it becomes a favorite terminology for the description of various divine and angelic «appearances». It occupies a prominent place in Biblical anthropomorphic debates. Both terms כבוד and דמות are intimately connected through the notion of «hiddeness» of the Divine form/glory. Later Jewish *Shᶜiur Qomah* traditions stress the aspect of the hiddeness of דמות: «His דמות is hidden from everyone, but no one's דמות is hidden from Him». M. S. Cohen, The Shiᶜur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism (Lanham, 1983) 113. For a fuller discussion see A. De Conick, Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas (Leiden, 1996) (SVC, 33) 102–104.

[13] On the connections between P and Ezekiel see B. Stein, Der Begriff «Kebod Jahweh» (Emsdetten—Lechte, 1939) 299. See also Mettinger, The Dethronement of Sabaoth… 107–111.

[14] Mettinger, The Dethronement of Sabaoth… 116–117.

[15] Ibid. 117.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School… 201.

[18] Ibid. 202.

light. The hidden *Kavod* is revealed through its light.[19] This situation explains the wide use of the *Kavod* paradigm in the visions of light phenomena.

Kavod theology leads to the special type of transformational visions that can be found in various biblical and apocalyptic materials.[20] In the climactic points of these accounts, their visionaries normally «see» the extent of the divine glory, often portrayed as enthroned anthropomorphic figure. As a consequence of this encounter, the visionary experiences a dramatic external metamorphosis which often affects his face, limbs, and garments, making them luminescent. A classic example of such a transformational vision is the account of Moses' shining countenance in Ex 34 after his encounter with the Lord's *Kavod* on Mount Sinai. It is noteworthy that in the apocalyptic and Merkabah traditions the vision of the Lord's Glory («the King in His beauty») increasingly become the main teleological point of the heavenly ascents.

Enoch's transformation in the Slavonic apocalypse also belongs to the *Kavod* paradigm. Enoch's luminous metamorphosis took place in the front of the Lord's glorious «extent», labeled in *2 Enoch* as the Lord's «Face».[21] From this Enochic account we learn that the vision of the Divine «Face» had dramatic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endures radical changes as it becomes covered with the divine light. A significant detail in this description is that Enoch is not transformed into light but covered, «clothed», with the light of God's Glory. The use of delightful oil as a covering substance emphasizes this «covering nature» of the luminous metamorphosis.

In Enoch's radiant metamorphosis before the Divine Face an important detail can be found which links Enoch's transformation with that of Moses' account in Exodus. In *2 Enoch* 37 we learn about the unusual procedure performed on Enoch's face in the final stage of his encounter with the Lord. The text informs that the Lord called one of his senior angels to chill the face of

[19] De Conick, Seek to See Him… 104–105. De Conick's research investigates the relationships between God's form and God's light, showing their complexity. She argues that in some traditions God's form remains hidden behind His light. The hidden *Kavod* is revealed through its light. «The visionary can only gain access to a vision of the deity through the deity's light». Ibid.

[20] G. Quispel, Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis // *VC* 34 (1980) 1–13.

[21] «I saw the view of the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot in a fire and brought out, and it emits sparks and is incandescent. Thus even I saw the face of the Lord. But the face of the Lord is not to be talked about, it is so very marvelous and supremely awesome and supremely frightening. And who am I to give an account of the incomprehensible being of the Lord, and of his face, so extremely strange and indescribable? And how many are his commands, and his multiple voice, and the Lord's throne, supremely great and not made by hands, and the choir stalls all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, and their never-silent singing. Who can give an account of his beautiful appearance, never changing and indescribable, and his great glory? And I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord» (*2 Enoch* 22:1–4, the longer recension). Andersen, 2 Enoch… 136.

Enoch. The text says that the angel appeared frigid; he was as white as snow, and his hands were as cold as ice. The text further depicts the angel chilling Enoch's face, who could not endure the terror of the Lord, «just as it is not possible to endure the fire of a stove and the heat of the sun...».[22] Right after this «chilling procedure», the Lord informs Enoch that if his face had not been chilled here, no human being would have been able to look at his face.[23] This reference to the radiance of Enoch's face after his encounter with the Lord is an apparent parallel to the incandescent face of Moses after the Sinai experience in Ex 34.

In spite of the dominant role of the *Kavod* pattern in biblical and apocalyptic theophanic accounts, it becomes increasingly challenged in the post-biblical rabbinic[24] and patristic environments which offered new understandings of the transformational vision. In these new developments, one can see a growing emphasis on the interiorization of the visionary experience.[25] Among

[22] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 160.

[23] Ibid.

[24] It becomes especially notable in Hekhaloth mysticism, where the teleology of the mystical journeys came to be expressed in terms of descent into the Merkabah. On Merkabah and Hekhaloth mysticism, see: P. Alexander, The Historical Settings of the Hebrew Book of Enoch // *JJS* 28 (1977) 156–180; D. Blumenthal, Understanding Jewish Mysticism: A Source Reader. 2 vols (New York, 1978); I. Chernus, Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism (Berlin—New York, 1982) (SJ, 11); M. Cohen, The Shi'ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism (Lanham, 1983); J. Greenfield, Prolegomenon // H. Odeberg, 3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch (New York, 1973) xi–xlvii; I. Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism (Leiden, 1980) (AGJU, 14); I. Gruenwald, M. Smith, The Hekhaloth Literature in English (Chico, CA, 1983); D. Halperin, The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision (Tübingen, 1988) (TSAJ, 16); D. Halperin, The Merkavah in Rabbinic Literature (New Haven, 1980); M. Idel, Enoch is Metatron // *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–240; L. Jacobs, Jewish Mystical Testimonies (New York, 1977); N. Janowitz, The Poetics of Ascent: Theories of Language in a Rabbinic Ascent Text (Albany, 1989); M. Morgan, Sepher ha-Razim: The Book of Mysteries (Chico, CA, 1983) (TTPS, 11); C. Morray-Jones, Hekhaloth Literature and Talmudic Tradition; Alexander's Three Test Cases // *JJS* 22 (1991) 1–39; C. Newsom, Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition (Atlanta, 1985) (HSS, 27); A. Orlov, Titles of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch // *JSP* 18 (1998) 71–86; P. Schäfer, M. Schlüter, H. G. von Mutius, Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur (Tübingen, 1981) (TSAJ, 2); P. Schäfer, The Hidden and Manifest God (Albany, 1992); P. Schäfer *et al*., Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literatur. 4 vols. (Tübingen, 1987–1995) (TSAJ, 17, 22, 29, 46); G. Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic tradition (New York, 1965); idem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (New York, 1954); N. Séd, Les traditions secrètes et les disciples de Rabban Yohannan ben Zakkai // *RHR* 184 (1973) 49–66; M. Swartz, Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: An Analysis of Ma'aseh Merkavah (Tübingen, 1992) (TSAJ, 28).

[25] On the issue of the interiorization of transformational visions see: A. Golitzin, Liturgy and Mysticism: The Experience of God in Eastern Orthodox Christianity // *Pro Ecclesia* 2 (1999) 159–186; Ieromonah Alexander (Golitzin), Forma lui Dum-

the new notions employed for the purposes of such a paradigm shift was the prominent biblical concept of the image of God after which Adam was created.

In the Likeness of God's Image

In his book *Makarius, Das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle*[26] Gilles Quispel draws the reader's attention to an interesting tradition preserved in Homily II.12[27] of Pseudo-Macarius. From the homily we learn that «Adam, when he transgressed the commandment, lost two things. First, he lost the pure possession of his nature, so lovely, created according to the image and likeness of God (κατ᾽ εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ). Second, he lost the very image itself (αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα) in which was laid up for him, according to God's promise, the full heavenly inheritance» (II.12.1).[28] Further, another important passage in the homily informs the reader that Adam and Eve before the Fall were clothed (ἐνδεδυμένοι) with God's glory in place of clothing (II.12.8).[29] The text reveals a certain continuity between Adam's «very image itself» and his glorious clothing. An important detail in the narrative is that the homilist makes a distinction between Adam's nature, created according to the image and likeness of God[30] and Adam's «very image (εἰκόνα)

nezeu şi Vederea Slavei. Reflecţii Asupra Controversei Antropomorfite Din Anul 399 D. Hr. // IDEM, *Mistagogia.* Experienþa lui Dumnezeu în Ortodoxie (Sibiu, 1998) 184–267; N. SÉD, La shekinta et ses amis araméens // *COr* 20 (1988) 133–142.

[26] G. QUISPEL, Makarius, Das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle (Leiden, 1967) (SNT, 15) 57–58.

[27] There are four Byzantine medieval collections of the Macarian Homilies. Three of them appeared in critical editions. Collection I was published in Makarios/Simeon: Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung I des *Vaticanus Graecus* 694 (B). 2 vols / Ed. H. BERTOLD (Berlin, 1973) (GCS). Collection II appeared in: H. DÖRRIES, E. KLOSTERMANN, M. KROEGER, Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios (Berlin, 1964) (PTS, 4). Collection III appeared in Neue Homilien des Makarios/Simeon aus Typus III / Eds. E. KLOSTERMANN, H. BERTHOLD (Berlin, 1961) (TU, 72) and Pseudo-Macaire, *Oeuvres spirituelles*. Vol. I: Homélies propres à la Collection III / Ed. V. DESPREZ (Paris, 1980) (SC, 275). In our references to the Macarian homilies the first uppercase Roman numeral will designate the Collection, following Arabic numerals will designate the specific homily and its subsections.

[28] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter* / Transl. G. A. MALONEY, S.J. (New York, 1992) 97. DÖRRIES, KLOSTERMANN, KROEGER, Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios… 107–108.

[29] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*… 100.

[30] It is important that Genesis 1:26 stresses that Adam's צלם was created after God's own צלם, being some sort of luminous «imitation» of the glorious צלם of God. Some scholars even argue that «in this way, the likeness that Adam and God shared is not physicality — in the normal sense of having a body — but luminescence». D. H. AARON, Shedding Light on God's Body in Rabbinic Midrashim: Reflections on the Theory of a Luminous Adam // *HTR* 90 (1997) 303.

itself», speaking about them as of two separate entities which were lost during the Fall. This subtle theological distinction shows the author's familiarity with the Jewish aggadic traditions about *tselem* (Heb. צלם) of Adam — the luminous image of God's glory according to which Adam was created.[31]

The term «image» (Gk. εἰκών) can be found in a number of significant New Testament passages. The most important of them for the purposes of the current investigation is the Pauline description of Christ as the «image of the invisible God» in Col 1:15, which has often been compared to the account of the creation of Adam and seen as part of Paul's Adam Christology.[32] This theological connection between Adam's creation after the image of God and Christ as the image of God has opened several possibilities for using ancient aggadic traditions about the luminous *tselem* of Adam in new Christian theophanic contexts. In Pauline writings we can also see peculiar terminological parallels in which the notion of image (εἰκών) becomes closely associated with important theophanic concepts, prominent in traditional *Kavod* theology, such as glory[33] (δόξα)[34] and form (μορφή). [35]

[31] For discussions about the luminous garment/image/body of Adam see: Aaron, Shedding Light on God's Body… 299–314; S. Brock, Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition // Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter (Regensburg, 1982) (Eichstätter Beiträge, 4) 11–40; A. D. De Conick, J. Fossum, Stripped before God: A New Interpretation of Logion 37 in the Gospel of Thomas // *VC* 45 (1991) 141; L. Ginzberg, The Legends of the Jews. 7 vols (Philadelphia, 1955) Vol. 5. 97; A. G. Gottstein, The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature // *HTR* 87 (1994) 171–195; B. Murmelstein, Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre // *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 35 (1928) 255; W. Staerk, Die Erlösererwartung in den östlichen Religionen (Stuttgart—Berlin, 1938) 11.

[32] J. Fossum, The Image of the Invisible God (Göttingen, 1995) (NTOA, 30) 15. Cf. also: A. Schlatter, Die Theologie der Apostel (Stuttgart, 1922) 299; M. Black, The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam // *SJT* 7 (1954) 174–179; R. Scroggs, The Last Adam (Philadelphia, 1966) 97–99.

[33] See for example 2 Cor 4:4: «...the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God...»

[34] H. A. W. Meyer, J. Weiss and J. Behm understand Paul's concept of μορφή as the divine Glory (δόξα), believing that «in Pauline sense, Christ was from the beginning no other than כבוד, δόξα of God himself, the glory and radiation of his being, which appears almost as an independent hypostasis of God and yet is connected intimately with God». See R. P. Martin, Carmen Christi. Philippians 2.5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship (Cambridge, 1967) 104–105. One of the major exponents of the hypothesis, J. Behm, in Kittel's TDNT, argues that the statement in Phillipians 2:6 about the form of God corresponds closely with the statement in John 17:5 about the glory which «I had with Thee before the world was». TDNT. Vol. 4. 751.

[35] Biblical scholars argue that μορφή and εἰκών are used as interchangeable terms in the LXX and in Paul. For example, an investigation of the Old Testament's con-

Other important theological developments in Gnostic[36] and rabbinic circles lead to a gradual «interiorization» of the *tselem* imagery. In postbiblical Jewish accounts, *tselem* is often identified with the luminous «clothing» of the human heart. Scholem's research shows that in Jewish mysticism *tselem* was also understood as a sort of «garment» of the soul, which «floats» over it. He observes that «this garment also becomes the soul's heavenly attire when it returns to Paradise after death».[37] This Jewish idea of the «inner» luminous *tselem* might well be already known in Christian circles, particularly in the Syriac environment.

It is also possible that Ephraem, Macarius, and some other Syrian Christian writers might have acquired the notion of the luminous human *tselem* through their familiarity with the Targums, the Aramaic renderings of the Hebrew Bible, which attest to traditions about the original luminosity of Adam and Eve.[38]

It is noticeable that in the Macarian homilies and other Eastern Christian writings the notion of luminous *tselem* became gradually employed for the purposes of the internalized beatific vision. *Tselem* became utilized as a sort of theological counterpart to the classic concept of the divine *Kavod* which traditionally played a prominent role in biblical and apocalyptic visions. Sometimes both imageries were used interchangeably.

In the patristic environment the concept of the image of God gradually became a «safer» way to convey visionary experiences of the light phenomena, especially after the anthropomorphite controversy of 399 CE,[39] when antianthropomorpic polemics[40] made it increasingly difficult to employ the tra-

nection between terms צלם and דמות in the light of their translation in the LXX as μορφή lead scholars to believe that «μορφή in Philippians 2:6 is immediately related to the concept εἰκών, since the Semitic root word צלם can correspond to either of the two Greek words». Martin, Carmen Christi. Philippians 2.5–11… 108. For the discussion of the body/image of Christ in Pauline thought see Fossum, The Image of the Invisible God…

[36] J. Fossum observes that in some Gnostic circles «'the shining,' 'image,' or 'likeness' of God, after which the body of the earthly man was fashioned appears as a separate entity, even some form of hypostasis». Fossum, The Image of the Invisible God… 16.

[37] G. Scholem, On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead (New York, 1976) 264.

[38] Cf. Brock, Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression… 11–40.

[39] On the anthropomorphite controversy see: E. A. Clark, The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate (Princeton, 1992); G. Gould, The Image of God and the Anthropomorphite Controversy in Fourth Century Monasticism // R. J. Daly (ed.), Origeniana Quinta (Leuven, 1992) (BETL, CV) 549–557.

[40] On antianthropomorphic polemics see E. A. Clark, New Perspectives on the Origenist Controversy: Human Embodiment and Ascetic Strategies // *ChH* 59 (1990) 145–162; L. Hennessey, A Philosophical Issue of Origen's Eschatology: The Three

ditional «anthropomorphic» language of beatific visions, including the classical *Kavod* imagery.[41] By the fourth century in the patristic trinitarian debates about the divine light the *Kavod* terminology was almost completely substituted by the symbolism of the divine image.

A thousand years later, in the Hesychast transformational visions of the Taboric light, the concept of the image of God still continued to play a crucial

Senses of Incorporeality // Daly, Origeniana Quinta… 373–380; J. A. McGuckin, The Changing Forms of Jesus // L. Lies (ed.), Origeniana Quarta (Innsbruck—Wien, 1987) (Innsbrucker Theologische Studien, 19) 215–222; D. L. Paulsen, Early Christian Belief in a Corporeal Deity: Origen and Augustine as Reluctant Witnesses // *HTR* 83:2 (1990) 105–116; G. Stroumsa, The Incorporeality of God: Context and Implications of Origen's Position // *Religion* (1983) 345–358.

[41] Similar antropomorphic developments are also noticiable in postbiblical Jewish mysticism, with its gradual elaboration of the צלם concept. In Jewish tradition צלם played an important role in anthropomorphic developments. It was understood not simply as an abstract likeness but had a strong «corporeal meaning». See Gottstein, The Body as Image of God… 174. See also: Scholem, On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead… 251–273. Gottstein's research deals with a number of rabbinic texts that reveal this «corporeal» understanding of צלם. He argues that in some instances it is interchangeable with other Hebrew terms for the designation of «body», like the term דמות. Speaking about these corporeal meanings of צלם Gottstein notes that «…Adam's *tselem* is his luminous body. In other sources, such as the story of Hillel washing his body [*Lev. R.* 34.3], the *tselem* referred to the physical body. *Tselem* can be thus refer to various levels, or aspects, all of which bear a resemblance to the physical body. I would propose that these various levels, or various bodies, reflect one another. The physical body is a reflection of the body of light. This reflection may translate itself down to the details of circumcision. The kind of graded devolutionary process that we encountered above may be a model for two ways of talking about *tselem*. The *tselem* in its original form may be lost, but the dimmer reflection of this form is extant in the physical body, which may still be spoken of as *tselem*». Gottstein, The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature… 188. Rabbinic literature gives a number of references to traditions about the luminosity of the original *tselem* of Adam. One of them can be found in *Lev. R.* 20.2. in which «Resh Lakish, in the name of R. Simeon the son of Menasya, said: The apple of Adam's heel outshone the globe of the sun; how much more so the brightness of his face! Nor need you wonder. In the ordinary way if a person makes salvers, one for himself and one for his household, whose will he make more beautiful? Not his own? Similarly, Adam was created for the service of the Holy One, blessed be He, and the globe of the sun for the service of mankind». H. Freedman, M. Simon (tr.), Midrash Rabbah. 10 vols (London, 1939) Vol. 4. 252. Another important passage which can be found in *Gen. R.* 20.12 tells us that the scroll of Rabbi Meir reads «garments of light» instead of «garments of skin», stressing thus that Adam has not lost completely his luminous quality even after the Fall: «In R. Meir's Torah it was found written, 'Garments of light': this refers to Adam's garments, which were like a torch [shedding radiance], broad at the bottom and narrow at the top». Freedman, Simon, Midrash Rabbah… Vol. 1. 171.

theological role. It is especially noticeable in Gregory Palamas' theology of the divine image which shows amazing parallels to the concepts and imagery of Macarius. Among them is an open employment of the Adamic *Gestalt*. Palamas, following Macarius, draws heavily on ancient traditions about the luminous *tselem* of Adam. In *One Hundred and Fifty Texts*, he argues that «Adam, before the fall, also participated in this divine illumination and resplendence, and because he was truly clothed in a garment of glory he was not naked, nor was he unseemly by reason of his nakedness».[42] The Syrian background of Palamas' speculation about Adam is evident.[43] Recognizing the tragic consequences which Adam's fall had for the condition of the human *tselem,*[44] he reaffirms its irrevocable value for the inner transformational vision: «Leaving aside other matters for the present, I shall simply say that perfection of the divine likeness is accomplished by means of the divine illumination that issues from God».[45]

The theme of regaining this lost luminous image of God, «the dimmer reflection», which is still mysteriously extant in the human physical body (sometimes in the form of a luminous «clothing» of the heart) and can be eventually «restored», had a number of interesting theological ramifications in the Hesychast tradition.[46] The Hesychast idea of the light-like (φωτοειδές) sensitive nature of man[47] shows clear similarities with this early Syrian understanding of the luminous *tselem* as a reflection of God's Glory.

Internalization of the Kavod

It was mentioned earlier that in some biblical accounts the figure of Moses is often connected with the *Kavod* theology.[48] This tendency is traceable both in the Old Testament Exodus stories and in the New Testament accounts

[42] *Philokalia*… Vol. 4. 377.

[43] An aggadic tradition, which survived in the Syrian environment, explains why Adam and Eve discovered their nakedness only after the Fall. According to the tradition, it happened because after their transgression they lost their original radiance — the «garments of light» which prevented them from seeing their naked «physical» bodies. Luminosity thus served for the prelapsarian humankind as a sort of screen which concealed their original form. Gregory Palamas clearly employs this tradition.

[44] «Even though we still bear God's image to a greater degree than the angels, yet as regards the likeness of God we fall far short of them». *Philokalia*… Vol. 4. 376.

[45] *Philokalia*… Vol. 4. 376.

[46] Cf. J. S. Romanides, Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics // *GOTR* 6 (1960–1961) 186–205 and *GOTR* 9 (1963–1964) 225–270.

[47] See Romanides, Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics… (*GOTR* 9) 235.

[48] On Moses' connection with the *Kavod* theology see: A. Orlov, Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition // *SBLSP* 39 (2000) 130–147.

of Christ's Transfiguration where Moses serves as a significant «theophanic» reminder. In postbiblical Jewish and Christian writings the Moses *Gestalt*, however, gradually became utilized for the purposes of internalized visions. It cannot be a coincidence that in these new theological «developments», the Moses account was also linked with the *tselem* imagery.

These tendencies are noticeable in the Macarian Homilies where Moses is often portrayed as Adam's luminous counterpart. Following the already mentioned Adamic narrative of Homily II.12, which tells us how Adam lost his luminous status and «obeyed his darker side», Macarius gives us Moses' example who «had a glory shining on his countenance». The homily refers to Moses' Sinai experience, expanding this tradition and adding some new significant details:

> Indeed, the Word of God was his food and he had a glory shining on his countenance. All this, which happened to him, was a figure of something else. For that glory now shines splendidly from within the hearts of Christians. At the resurrection their bodies, as they rise, will be covered (σκεπάζεται) with another vesture, one that is divine, and they will be nourished with a heavenly food (II.12.14).[49]

It is noticeable that the passage serves as a bridge between the symbolic worlds of the *Kavod* and *tselem*. Macarius openly «internalizes» the Moses account, stressing that Moses' glory now «shines splendidly from within the hearts of Christians». On the other hand, some features of the *Kavod*'s paradigm are still noticeable: the homilist understands Moses' luminosity as a covering with God's glory.[50] The author's further discussion in II.12.15 about the clothing of Christians and wrapping them in «divine and glorious garments» gives additional strength to this motif of Moses, covered with the luminous garments of God's glory.

The tendencies for internalizing the *Kavod* paradigm through implications of the concept of God's image found in the Macarian Homilies demonstrate amazing similarities to some Jewish developments. The late Rabbinic midrashim attest to such traditions.[51] The origin of such theological innova-

[49] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*… 102. Dörries *et al.*, Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios… 114.

[50] The motif of covering with the Glory is also prominent in another Macarian passage which depicts Moses' shining countenance: «For blessed Moses provided us with a certain type through the glory of the Spirit which covered his countenance upon which no one could look with steadfast gaze (II.15.10)». Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*… 74.

[51] In Rabbinic literature the traditions about Moses as a luminous conterpart of Adam also can be found. Gottstein stresses that «the luminescent quality of the *tselem* is the basis for comparison between Moses and Adam in several rabbinical materials». Gottstein, The Body as Image of God… 182. *Deut. R.* 11.3 attests to such

tions can be found in its rudimentary form already in some Jewish apocalypses, notably in *2 Enoch* from which we learn that the Lord created Adam after His Face. F. Andersen stresses the theological uniqueness of such creational imagery. He, however, does not clarify what the creation after the Lord's Face means in the broader textual context of the Slavonic apocalypse. The Lord's Face plays an important role in *2 Enoch's* theophanic descriptions being identified with the Lord's glorious form — His *Kavod*. In chapter 22 of *2 Enoch* the Lord's Face emits light and fire and serves as the source of Enoch's luminous metamorphosis. In this context, the creation of Adam after the Lord's Face demonstrates a remarkable effort toward merging the *Kavod* and *tselem* paradigms of the transformational vision.

The previous investigation shows the important role of the Adam-Moses connection in the evolution from outer to inner in the *Kavod* imagery. It is clear, however, that in the Macarian writings the internalizing of the *Kavod* paradigm is not confined solely to the reevaluation of Moses' *Gestalt*. The effort is much more radical. In fact, it is so revolutionary that it strikes even distinguished students of the mystical traditions. One of them, Gershom Scholem, points to the amazing Macarian tendency for mystical «reinterpretation» of the Merkabah vision of Ezekiel in which the human soul become itself the throne of glory.[52] In Homily II.1.1–2 Macarius writes:

> When Ezekiel the prophet beheld the divinely glorious vision, he described it in human terms but in a way full of mysteries that completely surpass the powers of the human mind... And all of this which the prophet saw in ecstasy or in a trance was indeed true and certain, but it was only signifying and foreshadowing something no less hidden, something divine and mysterious, «a mystery hidden for generations» (Col 1:26) but that «has been revealed only in our time, the end of the ages», (1 Pt 1:20) when Christ appeared. For the prophet was viewing the mystery of the human soul that would receive its Lord and would become his throne of glory. For

traditions: «Adam said to Moses: "I am greater than you because I have been created in the image of God". Whence this? For it is said, "and God created man in his own image" (Gen. 1,27). Moses replied to him: "I am far superior to you, for the honor which was given to you has been taken away from you, as it is said: but man (Adam) abideth not in honor, (Ps. XLIX, 13) but as for me, the radiant countenance which God gave me still remains with me". Whence? For it is said: "his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated" (Deut. 34:7)». Freedman, Simon, Midrash Rabbah... Vol. 7. 173. Gottstein also gives another midrashic passage from *Midrash Tadshe* 4 in which Moses is again Adam's luminous counterpart: «In the likeness of the creation of the world the Holy One blessed be he performed miracles for Israel when they came out of Egypt... In the beginning: "and God created man in his image", and in the desert: "and Moshe knew not that the skin of his face shone"». Cf. A. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash. 6 vols. (Jerusalem, 1967) Vol. 3. 168.

[52] G. Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (New York, 1961) 79.

> the soul that is deemed to be judged worthy to participate in the light of the Holy Spirit by becoming his throne and habitation, and is covered with the beauty of ineffable glory of the Spirit, becomes all light, all face, all eye.[53]

Scholem, observing such a radical rethinking of classic *Kavod* imagery, further asks the legitimate question: «was there not a temptation to regard man himself as the representative of divinity, his soul as the throne of glory?»[54] Interestingly enough, this query directs us to the very heart of the Macarian theological enterprise in which the *Kavod* internalization become possible only as a consequence of the unique interrelationships between human and divine in the event of Christ's transfiguration.

Crystallization of the New Paradigm: The Macarian Account of the Lord's Transfiguration

The previous analysis shows that in the Macarian homilies Moses' shining countenance and the luminosity of Adam's prelapsarian *tselem* serve as metaphors for major paradigms of the transformational vision.

In the Macarian writings, one can also encounter a third paradigm of luminous transformation which is radically different from the previous two traditions. In a peculiar Macarian understanding of Christ's transfiguration[55] on Mt. Tabor, the duality of inner and outer in the *visio Dei* is expressed in a new metaphor of the transformational vision — Christ's «Body[56] of Light».[57]

---

[53] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*… 37.

[54] Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism… 79.

[55] The original Synoptic accounts of Christ's transfiguration seem influenced by the *Kavod* paradigm in its classical Exodus' form. Several details of the account serve as important reminders: the vision took place on a mountain, the presence of Moses, a bright cloud that enveloped the visionaries, a voice which came out of the cloud, and the shining face of Christ. On the Moses typology in the Synoptic accounts of the Transfiguration see: J. A. McGuckin, The Transfiguration of Christ in Scripture and Tradition (Lewiston, 1986) (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, 9) 1–19; J. Markus, The Way of the Lord (Louisville, 1992) 80–93; M. E. Thrall, Elijah and Moses in Mark's Account of the Transfiguration // *NTS* 16 (1969–1970) 305–317.

[56] The verb from the Synoptic account implies that Jesus' body was changed. Cf. J. Behm // TDNT. Vol. 4. 755–757.

[57] Another important testimony to the Lord's Body of Light is *Pseudo-Clementine Homily* 17:7 which pictures the brilliant radiance of Christ's body in connection with Christ's image: «For He has shape, and He has every limb primarily and solely for beauty's sake, and not for use. For He has not eyes that He may see with them; for He sees on every side, since He is incomparably more brilliant in His body than the visual spirit which is in us, and He is more splendid than everything, so that in comparison with Him the light of the sun may be reckoned as darkness. Nor has He ears that He may hear; for He hears, perceives, moves, energizes, acts on every side. But

Macarius makes an important theological statement when he observes that in His Transfiguration Christ was not just covered by the Glory but «was transfigured into (μετεμορφώθη εἰς) divine glory and into infinite light (εἰς τὸ φῶς τὸ ἄπειρον)» (II.15.38).[58]

In II.15.38 the homilist elaborates this ingenious understanding of Christ's transfiguration in which the internal and external aspects of transformational mystical experience are absolutely resolved:

> For as the body of the Lord was glorified when he climbed the mount and was transfigured into the divine glory and into infinite light, so also the bodies of the saints are glorified and shine like lightning.[59] Just as the interior glory of Christ covered his body and shone completely, in the same way also in the saints the interior power of Christ in them in the day will be poured out exteriorly upon their bodies... (II.15.38).[60]

The language of the passage further reinforces the totality of this transformational vision — Christ's internal glory serves as the teleological source of his complete, luminous metamorphosis.

In the articulation of the newness of Christ's condition, Macarius thus offers a completely new paradigm of the beatific vision — the bodies of visionaries are now not simply covered externally with the divine light but are «lightened»[61] in the way as many lamps are lightened from the one:

He has the most beautiful shape on account of man, that the pure in heart may be able to see Him, that they may rejoice because they suffered. For He molded man in His own shape as in the grandest seal, in order that he may be the ruler and lord of all, and that all may be subject to him. Wherefore, judging that He is the universe, and that man is His image (for He is Himself invisible, but His image man is visible), the man who wishes to worship Him honours His visible image, which is man». A. Roberts, J. Donaldson (eds.), The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 10 vols (Grand Rapids, 1950–1951) Vol. 8. 319–320. It is important that here Christ's luminosity is placed into the account of Adam's creation after God's image. The phrase «He is incomparably more brilliant in his body than the visual spirit which is in us» deserves particular attention since it can refer to the correspondence between the Lord's luminous «body» and the Adamic *tselem*.

[58] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*... 122–123. Dörries *et al.*, Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios... 149–150.

[59] Origen in *Princ.* 2.3.7 remarks that the best and purest spirits must have some kind of body, being changed according to their degree of merit into an ethereal condition, and interprets «change» in 1 Cor 15:52 as «shining with light».

[60] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*... 122–123; Dörries *et al.*, Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios... 149–150.

[61] It is noteworthy that the homilist applies the imagery of «covering» not only to the physical bodies of these Christians but also to their souls which according to him will be «covered with the beauty of the ineffable glory of the light of Christ». Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*... 37.

> Similarly, as many lamps are lighted from the one, same fire, so also it is necessary that the bodies of the saints, which are members of Christ, become the same which Christ himself is (II.15.38).[62]

In this new concept of the transformational vision, Macarius, however, sets a significant distinction between Christ's Transfiguration and human luminous transformation. In contrast to the Lord's metamorphosis, the bodies of mortals cannot be completely «transfigured into the divine glory» but rather simply become «glorified».

The hypostatic quality of Christ's luminous form is what differentiates Him from transformed Christians who are only predestined to participate in the light of His Glory and «have put on the raiment of ineffable light».[63] This articulation of the distinction between Christ's hypostasis and His light will play later an important role in Palamas' dialectics of God's essence and the divine energies.

Conclusion

It is time to return to the passage from the *Philokalia* which began this investigation. In comparison with the «traditional» cases of transformational visions, this account might appear as quite ambiguous. It demonstrates the absence of significant details of such visions in which the luminous metamorphosis of a visionary becomes possible as the consequence of the beatific vision of the glorious «form» of the Deity. The teleological necessity of such a divine form, in its external or internal manifestations, seems to presuppose the very possibility of any luminous metamorphosis. On the contrary, in the *Philokalia* account a visionary does not see any luminous form, but «the open space within the heart», which, however, makes him entirely luminous.

The answer to this strange situation can be found in the Macarian understanding of Christ's transfiguration on Mount Tabor which plays a paradigmatic role in later Hesychastic visions of the divine light. Macarius' position implies that Christ in the Tabor story represents both aspects of the transformational vision. First, He is the Glory after which a visionary is transformed. Second, He is also the visionary himself, whose face and garments are transformed.[64] In the Macarian writings Christ's interior glory is poured out upon his external body, making it luminous.

---

[62] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*… 122–123; Dörries *et al.*, Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios… 149–150.

[63] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*… 44.

[64] The luminous face and the transformed garments of Christ in the Synoptic accounts of the Transfiguration may stress the role of Christ as a visionary of His own glory. It parallels the shining face of Moses after his visionary experience on Mount Sinai and to the transformation of visionaries' garments in Jewish and Christian apocalypses.

> For as the body of the Lord was glorified when he climbed the mount and was transfigured into the divine glory and into infinite light, so also the bodies of the saints are glorified and shine like lightning. Just as the interior glory of Christ covered his body and shone completely, in the same way also in the saints the interior power of Christ in them in the day will be poured out exteriorly upon their bodies.... (II.15.38).[65]

In the light of the Macarian account of Christ's transfiguration, the requirement for the divine glorious form as the transforming source of the visionary experience becomes replaced by the notion of the divine energies. It becomes possible since the locus of the visionary's perspective now is not external to the divine luminous form, but is rather immanent within it. In this situation the dichotomy between the subject of the beautific vision and the object of the beautific vision can be easily overcome.

A Hesychast in his transformational vision intends to resemble Christ in the Transfiguration. He focuses his physical and intellectual gaze not on the outside but on the inside, upon his heart, «where all the powers of the soul reside», waiting patiently that the interior power of Christ will lighten him as a lamp, so he can «become the same which Christ himself is». Divine glory here, just as in the *Kavod* tradition, is still confined within the anthropomorphic form, but there is a substantial difference — this human form is now the visionary himself, who imitates Christ's transfiguration, whose inner glory pours out exteriorly upon the body.

ABSTRACT

In the Second Temple apocalyptic materials visionaries normally «see» the extent of the divine glory, God's *Kavod*, often portrayed as enthroned anthropomorphic figure. As a consequence of this encounter, the visionary experiences a dramatic external metamorphosis which often affects his face, limbs, and garments, making them luminescent. In spite of the dominant role of the *Kavod* pattern in biblical and apocalyptic theophanic accounts, it becomes increasingly challenged in the postbiblical rabbinic and patristic environments which offered new understandings of the transformational vision. In these new developments, one can see a growing emphasis on the interiorization of the visionary experience. The article investigates the formative role of the Macarian Homilies in the transition from outer to inner in the transformational visions of Eastern Christian tradition.

[65] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*... 122–123; Dörries *et al.*, Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios... 149–150.

Part Two: Jewish Texts

Andrei A. Orlov
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

«WITHOUT MEASURE AND WITHOUT ANALOGY»: THE TRADITION OF THE DIVINE BODY IN *2 (SLAVONIC) ENOCH*

Introduction

In one of his books[1] Gershom Scholem remarks on the origins of the terminology associated with the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials.[2] These materials depict visionaries, Rabbi Ishmael and Rabbi Akiba, receiving from the supreme angel Metatron revelations of the «measurement of the body» (in Hebrew, *Shi'ur Qomah*), an anthropomorphic description of the Deity together with the mystical names of its gigantic limbs.[3] Although the majority of evidence of the *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition survived in late Jewish writings, Scholem argues[4] that the beginning of *Shi'ur Qomah* speculations can be dated not later than the second century CE. Scholem appeals to a passage in *2 Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse apparently written in the first century CE, which in his opinion represents the earliest witness to the *Shi'ur Qomah* terminology. The passage is situated in *2 Enoch* 39 where the antediluvian patriarch Enoch tells his children about the vision of the Lord, whom he encountered during his celestial tour. Enoch describes the appearance of the Lord as a terrifying extent analogous to the human form:

> And now, my children it is not from my lips that I am reporting to you today, but from the lips of the Lord who has sent me to you. As for you, you hear my words, out of my lips, a human being created equal to yourselves; but I have heard the words from the fiery lips of the Lord. For the lips of the Lord are a furnace of fire, and his words are the fiery flames which come out. You, my children, you see my face, a human being created just like

[1] G. Scholem, On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in the Kabbalah (New York, 1991), 29.

[2] For texts and translations of the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials, see: P. Schäfer, with M. Schlüter and H. G. von Mutius, Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur (Tübingen, 1981) (TSAJ, 2); M. Cohen, The Shi'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions (Tübingen, 1985) (TSAJ, 9); P. Schäfer et al., Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literatur (Tübingen, 1987–95) (TSAJ, 17, 22, 29, 46).

[3] G. Scholem, Origins of the Kabbalah (Princeton, 1990) 20.

[4] Ibid. 20.

> yourselves; I am one who has seen the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot by a fire, emitting sparks. For you gaze into (my) eyes, a human being created just like yourselves; but I have gazed into the eyes of the Lord, like the rays of the shining sun and terrifying the eyes of a human being. You, (my) children, you see my right hand beckoning you, a human being created identical to yourselves; but I have seen the right hand of the Lord, beckoning me, who fills heaven. You see the extent of my body, the same as your own; but I have seen the extent of the Lord,[5] without measure and without analogy, who has no end... (*2 Enoch* 39:3–6).[6]

In his commentary on the text, Scholem draws the reader's attention to the expression «the extent of my body». He notes that earlier Abraham Kahana, in his Hebrew translation of *2 Enoch*,[7] rendered this expression as *shi^cur qomati*.[8] Scholem further suggests that despite the late date of the known rabbinic *Shi^cur Qomah* materials, the *Shi^cur Qomah* terminology might be already evident in the account drawn from *2 Enoch* 39 where Enoch describes God's gigantic limbs.

Scholem's suggestions are valuable[9] and deserve serious attention, since several additional features in the aforementioned account of *2 Enoch* also seem to suggest the imagery found in the *Shi^cur Qomah* tradition. In the Slavonic apocalypse, Enoch describes to his children the gigantic hand of the Lord which fills the heaven. This description recalls the imagery of the *Shi^cur Qomah* accounts in which Enoch-Metatron transmits to Rabbi Ishmael and Rabbi Akiba knowledge about the gigantic limbs of the Deity which fill the heaven. A series of analogies between Enoch's body and the Lord's body in *2 Enoch* 39:3–6 appears also pertinent because the later Merkabah accounts often portray Enoch-Metatron as possessing the gigantic body himself. Moreover, some of these accounts seem to depict Metatron as the measure of the Divine Body.

---

[5] **ѡбьѧтиє Гдсподнє**. М. И. Соколов, Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий, VII. Славянская книга Еноха Праведного. Тексты, латинский перевод и исследования / Посмертный труд автора подг. к изд. М. Сперанский // *ЧОИДР* 4 (1910) 1.94; 2.38.

[6] F. I. Andersen, 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 163.

[7] A. Kahana, Sefer Hanok B // Ha-Sefarim ha-Hitsonim le-Torah (Jerusalem, 1936f), 102–141.

[8] Scholem, On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead... 29.

[9] Ithamar Gruenwald supports Scholem's position, suggesting that the expression found in *2 Enoch* 39 may represent the first reference to the *Shi^cur Qomah* of God. Cf. I. Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism (Leiden, 1980) (AGJU, 14) 213. For criticism of Scholem's position, see: M. S. Cohen, The Shi^cur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism (New York, 1983) 80.

Scholem's comments about the significance of *2 Enoch* 39 for the history of early Jewish mysticism are important. His analysis, however, is incomplete since it focuses only on the *Shiʿur Qomah* passage found in chapter 39. It does not explore the broader context of the passage, especially its relation to other descriptions of Enoch in the Slavonic apocalypse that seem to recall the depictions of Metatron in the *Shiʿur Qomah* materials. Moreover, it appears that the traditions about the divine body are not limited in this text to the figure of Enoch and include another important character of the text, namely, the patriarch Adam. The portrayal of the prelapsarian Adam found in the longer recension of *2 Enoch* reveals fascinating similarities to the later *Shiʿur Qomah* descriptions. Keeping in mind these important features of the Slavonic apocalypse, this article will investigate the roles of Adam and Enoch in the broader context of the *Shiʿur Qomah* account found in *2 Enoch*.

Adamic Tradition of *2 Enoch*

Before proceeding to an investigation of the traditions about the divine body found in the Slavonic apocalypse, a short excursus into the Adamic narrative of *2 Enoch* is necessary. This narrative appears partly to be responsible for creating the polemical context in which the divine body traditions in the text are introduced and discussed.

Adam's story occupies a significant place in *2 Slavonic Enoch*. Accounts of the protoplast's creation and his fall can be found in all three major sections of the book.[10] The text depicts Adam as a glorious angelic being, predestined by God to be the ruler of the earth, but falling short of God's expectations. Although a large part of the Adamic materials belongs to the longer recension, a number of important passages related to this tradition are also attested in the shorter recension. The presence of Adamic materials in both recensions and the significance of the Adamic narrative for the whole theological framework of the Slavonic apocalypse lead the interpreter to conclude that they are not later interpolations, but belong to the original layer of the text.

It should be noted that such an extensive presence of Adamic materials in the early Enochic text is quite unusual. For instance, in the Enochic books, included in *1 (Ethiopic) Enoch,* Adamic traditions are not accentuated and are limited to a few insignificant remarks.[11] Moreover, Adam's image in *1 Enoch* is quite different from the one attested in the Slavonic Apocalypse. *1 Enoch's* materials do not provide any information about the elevated status of the protoplast.

[10] *2 Enoch* 30:8–32:2; 33:10; 41:1; 42:5; 44:1; 58:1–3; 71:28.

[11] See, *1 Enoch* 32:6; 37:1; 60:8; 69:9–11; 85:3; 90:37–38.

The modest role which Adam plays in the early Enochic books can be explained by the fact that Enochic and Adamic traditions often contend with each other in offering different explanations of the origin of evil[12] in the world.[13] From the point of view of this rivalry between Adamic and Enochic traditions, it might appear that the concentrated presence of Adamic materials in *2 Enoch* represents alien accretions interpolated into the original narrative much later during its long transmission in the Christian environment. A closer examination of the text, however, reveals that the presence of the Adamic tradition in the Slavonic apocalypse is neither secondary nor coincidental but has a profound conceptual value for the overall theology of the pseudepigraphon. It appears that the purpose of the extensive presence of Adamic materials in *2 Enoch* can be explained through the assessment of Enoch's image in the text.

Scholars have previously noted that Enoch's figure, portrayed in the various sections of *2 Enoch*, is more developed than in the early Enochic tractates of *1 Enoch*. For the first time, the Enochic tradition tries to portray the patriarch, not simply as a human taken to heaven and transformed into an angel, but as a celestial being exalted above the angelic world. In this attempt, one may find the origin of another image of Enoch (very different from the early Enochic literature) which was developed much later in Merkabah mysticism — the concept of the supreme angel Metatron, «the Prince of the Presence».[14] It is therefore possible that the traditions about the exalted status of Adam were introduced in *2 Enoch*, for the first time in the Enochic tradition, in order to enhance the new profile of the seventh antediluvian patriarch.[15]

---

[12] The Enochic tradition bases its understanding of the origin of evil on the Watchers story where the fallen angels corrupt human beings by passing on to them various celestial secrets. In contrast, the Adamic tradition traces the source of evil to Satan's disobedience and the transgression of Adam and Eve in Eden.

[13] M. Stone, The Axis of History at Qumran // Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls / Eds. E. Chazon, M. E. Stone (Leiden, 1999) (STDJ, 31) 133–149; J. C. Reeves, Exploring Early Jewish Mythologies of Evil (forthcoming).

[14] Philip Alexander observes that «the transformation of Enoch in *2 Enoch* 22 provides the closest approximation, outside Merkabah literature, to Enoch's transformation in *3 Enoch* 3–13». P. Alexander, 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 248.

[15] In 1987 Moshe Idel published an article in which he explored the role of the Adamic traditions in shaping the image of Enoch as the supreme angel Metatron. Although Idel's research deals mainly with later rabbinic materials, it demonstrates that already in some pseudepigraphic accounts Enoch appears to be portrayed as a luminous counterpart of Adam who regained Adam's glory, which was lost during the protoplast's transgression. Idel suggests that Enoch's luminous metamorphosis

The elevated prelapsarian condition of the protoplast as the archetype of exalted humanity appears to serve in the Slavonic apocalypse as a model for constructing the new super-angelic identity of Enoch.[16] In *2 Enoch* the seventh antediluvian patriarch acquired a host of roles and qualities which the Adamic narrative of the Slavonic apocalypse associates with the protoplast. One of these transferences includes the tradition of Adam's cosmic body that seems to play a formative role in creating such new identities of Enoch as the *measure* and the *measurer* of the divine body in the Slavonic apocalypse.

The Corporeality of the Protoplast

The later Jewish materials associated with the Merkabah tradition often depict Enoch-Metatron as the one who possesses a corporeal structure of cosmic dimensions. One of such testimonies can be found, for example, in *3 Enoch* 9,[17] which describes the transformation of the patriarch Enoch into

attested in *2 Enoch* 22 might also belong to the same tradition which views Enoch as the one who regained Adam's lost status and luminosity. He observes that to the best of his knowledge «Enoch is the only living person for whom we learn that luminous garments, reminiscent of Adam's lost garments of light, were made». M. Idel, Enoch is Metatron // *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990), 220–240. Alexander, in his recent research, adds new insight to Idel's argument about the formative value of the Adamic traditions for the image of the elevated Enoch. Alexander points to a number of rabbinic passages in which the «supernatural radiance» of Adam's heavenly soul, which departed from him when he sinned, then returned to be reincarnated in Enoch. He further observes that «behind these passages is a concept of Metatron as a divine entity first incarnate in Adam and then reincarnate in Enoch. Enoch, having perfected himself, in contrast to Adam, who sinned and fell, re-ascends to his heavenly home and takes his rightful place in the heights of the universe, above the highest angels.... Enoch thus becomes a redeemer figure — a second Adam through whom humanity is restored». P. Alexander, From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch // Biblical Figures Outside the Bible / Ed. M. E. Stone, T. A. Bergen (Harrisburg, 1998) 111.

[16] Christfried Böttrich, in his recent book: Adam als Microkosmos (Berlin, 1995) (Judentum und Umwelt, 59), attempted to investigate the Adamic traditions about the protoplast's creation out of the seven components and the correspondence of his name with the four corners of the world found in *2 Enoch* 30. Unfortunately, Böttrich's research completely ignored the polemical nature of the Adamic narrative in *2 Enoch* and its formative value for the elevated image of Enoch in this text. As a consequence Böttrich failed to uncover the function of the Adamic tradition in the larger theological framework of the Slavonic apocalypse and to discern the proper meaning in the polemical context of the divine body traditions in *2 Enoch*.

[17] See also: *3 Enoch* 48C:5–6: «I increased his stature (קומתו) by seventy thousand parasangs, above every height, among those who are tall of stature (בכל רומי הקומות). I magnified his throne from the majesty of my throne. I increased his honor from the glory of my honor. I turned his flesh to fiery torches and all the bones of his

the supreme angel Metatron. According to this text, during this celestial metamorphosis Enoch-Metatron «was enlarged and increased in size till [he] matched the world in length and breadth».[18] The materials associated with the *Shiᶜur Qomah* tradition[19] also describe Enoch-Metatron in similar terms, telling that «the stature of this youth fills the world[20] (והנער הזה קומתו מלא העולם)».[21]

Despite the prominent place that the traditions about the cosmic body of Enoch-Metatron occupy in the later Merkabah accounts, the early Enochic materials of the Second Temple period are silent about the great dimensions of the body of the elevated patriarch. The Enochic traditions attested in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Book of Giants* do not provide any hints about Enoch's gigantic body. In contrast to this silence about Enoch's corporeality, several early Jewish sources attest to the lore about the enormous body of another Biblical character, the patriarch Adam, which the protoplast possessed before his transgression in Eden. Thus, Philo in *QG* 1.32 unveils a tradition according to which «[the first humans] ... were provided with a very great body and the magnitude of a giant...».[22] A similar testimony can be found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, a Jewish text written around the first century CE. The *Apocalypse of Abraham* 23:4–6 relates the description of the terrifying corporalities of the protoplasts:

> And I looked at the picture, and my eyes ran to the side of the garden of Eden. And I saw there a man very great in height and terrible in breadth, incomparable in aspect, entwined with a woman was also equal to the man in aspect and size. And they were standing under the tree of Eden...[23]

Moreover, in some pseudepigraphical accounts the body of the protoplast is portrayed, not simply as gigantic, but even as comparable with the dimensions of the divine corporeality. Thus, in several pseudepigraphical materials the depictions of Adam's stature are often linked to the imagery of the enthroned divine anthropomorphic extent known from the priestly and Ezeke-

---

body (גופו) to coals of light. I made the appearance of his eyes like the appearance of lightning, and the light of his eyes like 'light unfailing.' I caused his face to shine like the brilliant light of the sun». Alexander, 3 Enoch… 312; Schäfer et al., Synopse… 36–37.

[18] Alexander, 3 Enoch… 263.

[19] Cohen, The Shiᶜur Qomah: Texts and Recensions… 159. Cf. also Cohen, The Shiᶜur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy… 162.

[20] «His body is 30,000,000 parasangs, and they call him, "Lad"». Cohen, The Shiᶜur Qomah: Texts and Recensions… 40–41.

[21] Schäfer et al, Synopse… 162.

[22] *Philo*, Questions and Answers on Genesis / Tr. R. Marcus (Cambridge—London, 1949) 19.

[23] R. Rubinkewicz, Apocalypse of Abraham // OTP. Vol. 1. 700.

lian sources as God's *Kavod*. One such association might be hinted at in *2 Enoch* 30; here the *Kavod* imagery seems to have been applied to Adam's prelapsarian condition. In this text the protoplast is labeled as «the second angel» to whom the Lord assigned four special stars. Jarl Fossum suggests[24] that, in view of the imagery attested in another Enochic texts where stars often designate angels, the allotment to Adam of the «four special stars» might allude to the fact that Adam, like God, also has his own «Princes of the Presence» — the four angels whose function is to serve near the Throne of Glory. This angelic imagery signals that *2 Enoch*'s authors might understand Adam as an enthroned entity resembling the Lord's glorious anthropomorphic extent, his *Kavod*.[25]

The *Testament of Abraham* 11:4 (Recension A) also attests to a similar tradition when it offers a depiction of «the first-formed Adam» seated on the throne at the entrance to paradise at the end of time: «And outside the two gates of that place, they saw a man seated on the golden throne. And the appearance of that man was terrifying, like the Master's».[26] Here again Adam is depicted as a resemblance of the Lord's *Kavod*, the divine form manifested on the Seat of Glory.[27]

It is intriguing that in Georgian, Armenian and Latin versions of the primary Adam books,[28] the protoplast is depicted as a being venerated by angelic hosts.[29] The tradition about the angelic veneration of the protoplast might

[24] J. Fossum, The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis // Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag. 2 vols. / Eds. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, P. Schäfer (Tübingen, 1996) Vol. 1. 535, n. 39.

[25] Further support for the suggestion that in *2 Enoch* Adam is enthroned is offered in that the text says that the Lord created open heaven in order that Adam might look upon the angels singing the triumphal song. This detail again recalls the traditional *Kavod* imagery where the angelic hosts sing the triumphal song before the enthroned King.

[26] E. Sanders, Testament of Abraham // OTP. Vol. 1. 888.

[27] On the traditions of Adam's enthronement, see: B. Munoa III, *Four Powers in Heaven. The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham* (Sheffield, 1998) (JSPSS, 28) 87–90.

[28] Cf. Georgian, Armenian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve* 13:2–14:2.

[29] Michael Stone recently demonstrated that one of the earliest instances of this tradition can be found in *2 Enoch* 22 where Enoch is transformed after the glory of God into a glorious angelic being venerated by angels. Stone points to the original Adamic mytheme behind this Enochic imagery. M. E. Stone, The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve* // Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays / Eds. G. Andersen, M. Stone, J. Tromp (Leiden, 2000) (SVTP, 15) 47.

also point to associations with the *Kavod* tradition in which one of the essential functions of angelic hosts in the celestial realm is veneration of the enthroned divine Glory.

The heterodox movements in early Christianity that are closely associated with Sethian and Adamic traditions also contain several important testimonies about Adam's body pertaining to the subject of our investigation.[30] Some of these accounts recall the imagery found in the later Merkabah accounts. Thus, the *Apocryphon of John* relates a tradition according to which the seven powers were responsible for the creation of the seven souls of Adam.[31] The text relates that the seven powers provided for the angels the seven substances of the soul in order to create the proportions of the limbs of Adam.[32] In the *Apocryphon* each of the limbs of the first man corresponds to the name of the angel responsible for its creation.[33] The detailed attention to the limbs of the first man and their naming according to angelic connotations seem to recall the later *Shiʿur Qomah* materials with their tendency to name the various parts of the cosmic body and for providing the detailed depictions of its limbs.[34]

All these early testimonies demonstrate that long before the traditions about the gigantic physique of Enoch-Metatron took their distinctive mold in the Merkabah tradition, a similar imagery was already applied in the Jewish pseudepigrapha and the Christian apocrypha to Adam's prelapsarian corporeality. As already mentioned, earlier scholars proposed that the Adamic imagery played a formative role in the shaping of the Metatron tradition. It is also possible that the concept of the cosmic body of the protoplast played a formative role in constructing the later Metatron's office as the measurer of the divine body. The beginning of this significant development might be detected already in *2 Enoch*. In order to support this hypothesis, our investigation will proceed in the following manner. First, we will explore in detail the tradition of Adam's body in the Slavonic apocalypse. Then, we will focus on the theme of Enoch's corporeality in the text. Finally, we will try to establish the relationship between both traditions in their connections with the motif of the Lord's *Shiʿur Qomah* found in chapter 39.

[30] Cf. for example: Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 1.30.6 «Ialdabaoth exclaimed, 'Come, let us make man after our image.' The six powers, on hearing this ... jointly formed a man of immense size, both in regard to breadth and length».

[31] The Apocryphon of John: Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II, 1; III, 1; and VI, 1 with BG 8502, 2 / Eds. M. Waldstein, F. Wisse (Leiden, 1995) (NMS, 33) 88–91.

[32] Ibid. 93.

[33] Ibid. 95–111.

From the Four Corners of the World

According to *2 Enoch* 30:12, the prelapsarian Adam was a very special celestial being. The Slavonic apocalypse defines him as a second angel who was great (Slav. великъ) and glorious. The Slavonic terminology used for the term «great» (великъ) appears to be related to the physical dimensions of the protoplast. *2 Enoch* 30:10 provides additional proof that the greatness might designate Adam's proportions. In this passage the Lord says that «even at his [Adam's] greatest (въ величѣ) he is small, and again at his smallest he is great».[35] The conjunction of the term «great» with the term «small» further supports the hypothesis that the epithet «greatness» in the text is applied to the dimensions of the first human.

Besides these general references to the «greatness» of Adam, the text also provides other hints about the dimensions of the patriarch's body. It appears that the most important evidences about the unusual frame of the protoplast in the Slavonic apocalypse are conveyed via the traditions about the creation and the naming of the protoplast.

In *2 Enoch* 30:13 the Lord tells Enoch that he created Adam out of the seven components and assigned to Adam a name from the four «components»: from East — (A), from West — (D), from North — (A), and from South — (M).[36] The correspondence of the anagram of Adam's name with the four corners of the earth might indicate that the dimensions of his body are considered identical with the size of the earth. The Slavonic text, however, does not make this connection explicitly. Moreover, the question remains if this passage about the anagram is really linked to the traditions about Adam's body. The analysis of the early evidences of the anagram's motif shows that this theme was often connected with the theme of Adam's bodily form. In order to illustrate this point, a short excursus in the history of this tradition is needed.

One of the early Jewish texts where a similar[37] tradition about the anagram can be found is the third book of *Sibylline Oracles*, a composition apparently written in Egypt around 160–150 BCE.[38] It is intriguing that already in the *Sibylline Oracles* 3:24–27[39] the anagram is linked to the motif of Adam's

[34] Cf. G. G. Stroumsa, Polymorphie divine et transformations d'un mythologème: l'Apocryphon de Jean et ses sources // *VC* 35 (1988) 412–434.

[35] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 152.

[36] The letters of this anagram correspond to Gk. ἀνατολή, δύσις, ἄρκτος, and μεσημβρία.

[37] The *Sibylline Oracles* have a slightly different sequence of the «corners»: east-west-south-north.

[38] J. J. Collins, Sibylline Oracles // OTP. Vol. 1. 355–356.

[39] John Collins observes that *Sibylline Oracles* 3:1–45 «finds its closest parallels in the Jewish Orphic fragments, which probably date to the second century B.C., and also in Philo». Collins, Sibylline Oracles… 360.

bodily form: «Indeed it is God himself who fashioned Adam, of four letters, the first-formed man, fulfilling by his name east and west and south and north. He himself fixed the shape of the form of men (αὐτὸς δ' ἐστήριξε τύπον μορφῆς μερόπων τε)».[40] The term «shape of the form» (τύπον μορφῆς) here seems to be related to the body of the protoplast. The conflation of the anagram of Adam's name with the shape of his form is significant for our investigation.[41]

Another Egyptian source,[42] a passage found in the writings of the Hermetic author, the alchemist Zosimos of Panopolis who lived in Alexandria in the late third or early fourth century CE,[43] also connects the tradition about the anagram of Adam's name with his body:[44] «...they have also spoken of him [Adam] symbolically, *according to his body*, through the four elements ... for his 'alpha' element indicates the east, the air, while his 'delta' element indicates the west, and the 'mu' element [indicates] midday...».[45]

It should be noted that the *Sibylline Oracles* 3 and the Zosimos passage, the two early attestations which link the anagram of Adam's name with his body, are both associated with the Egyptian milieu. A passage from Philo mentioned in our previous investigation indicates that by the first century CE the lore about the gigantic physique of the first humans appeared to be widespread in the Alexandrian environment. *2 Enoch*, which also contains a host of traditions pertaining to the protoplast's body, might have been also com-

[40] Collins, Sibylline Oracles… 362; Sibyllinische Weissagungen / Ed. A.-M. Kurfess (Berlin, 1951), 72.

[41] *Vita Adae et Evae* 27:1 also connects Adam's name with «the memory of the divine majesty». This expression might serve to designate Adam's glorious form, which represents «memory» or likeness of the divine form: «...My Lord, Almighty and merciful God, holy and faithful, do not let the name of the memory of your majesty be destroyed (*ne deleatur nomen memoriae tuae maiestatis*)». A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve / Second Revised Edition. Eds. G. A. Anderson, M. E. Stone (Atlanta, 1999) (EJL, 17) 32–32E.

[42] It is significant that the *Sibylline Oracles* and the Zosimos passage are both connected with the Egyptian environment, a place of possible provenance of *2 Enoch*. One should also note that the aforementioned research of C. Böttrich also refers to the passages from the *Sibylline Oracles* and Zosimos. Böttrich, however, did not recognize them as a chain of references to the body of the protoplast. Cf. Böttrich, Adam als Microkosmos… 23–27.

[43] A. J. Festugière, La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste. Vol. I: L'Astrologie et les sciences occultes (Paris, 1983) 239.

[44] Cf. B. A. Pearson, Enoch in Egypt // For A Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity / Eds. R. A. Argall, B. A. Bow, R. A. Werline (Harrisburg, 2000) 222

[45] For the Greek text, see: M. E. Berthelot, Ch.-Ém. Ruelle, Collection des Anciens Alchimistes Grecs. 2 vols. (Paris, 1888) Vol. 2. 231.

posed at the same time and place, namely, in the Alexandrian Diaspora of the first century CE.

The tradition in which the anagram of Adam's name was associated with his body was not lost in the melting pot of the Alexandrian environment but was carefully transmitted by later Jewish traditions. The same tendency to link the name of Adam derived from the Greek designations of the four corners of the world with his body is observable in the rabbinic materials. The difference between the early accounts found in the *Sibylline Oracles* and Zosimos of Panopolis and these rabbinic materials is that the latter explicitly identify the anagram, not simply with Adam's body, but with his cosmic body, which according to the rabbinic accounts was created «from one end of the universe to the other». This tradition is attested in a great variety of the rabbinic sources.

For example, the passage from *Gen. R.* 8:1 reads:

> R. Tanhuma in the name of R. Banayah and R. Berekiah in the name of R. Leazar said: He created him [Adam] as a lifeless mass extending from one end of the world to the other; thus it is written, Thine eyes did not see mine unformed substance (Ps. CXXXIX, 16). R. Joshua b. R. Nehemiah and R. Judah b. R. Simon in R. Leasar's name said: He created him filling the whole world. How do we know [that he stretched] from *east to west*? Because it is said, «Thou hast formed me behind and before». From *north to south*? Because it says, Since the day that God created man upon the earth, and from the one end of heaven unto the other (Deut. IV, 32). and how do we know that he filled the empty spaces of the world? From the verse, «And laid Thy hand upon me» (as you read, Withdraw Thy hand from me (Job XIII, 21)).[46]

This passage indicates that the speculations about the cosmic body of the protoplast in the rabbinic literature were juxtaposed with the tradition about the correspondence of Adam's name with the four corners of the earth. It is remarkable that the passage from *Gen. R.* 8:1 has exactly the same «sequence» of the corners as *2 Enoch*, namely «from east (A) to west (D)» and from «north (A) to south (M)», which precisely corresponds to the sequence of the letters of Adam's name. The presence of the anagram in the midrashic text points to its ancient Hellenistic origin since the anagram does not carry any meaning in Hebrew, but only in Greek. This tradition about the correspondence of Adam's cosmic body with the four corners of the world and the four letters of his name was widespread in rabbinic literature and was repeated multiple times in *Gen. R.* 21:3, *Gen. R.* 24:2, *Lev. R.* 14:1, and *Lev. R.* 18:2. It is significant that all these passages have the same order of the corners of

[46] Midrash Rabbah. 10 vols. / Trs. H. Freedman, M. Simon (London, 1939) Vol. 1. 54–55.

the world: from east to west and from north to south. A similar tradition can be also found in the *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* and the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* where the motif of Adam's gigantic body created from the four corners of the world is conflated with the story of the veneration of the protoplast by the creatures who mistakenly perceived him as a deity.[47]

Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 11 reads:

> He [God] began to collect the dust of the first man from the four corners of the world... He [Adam] stood on his feet and was adorned with the Divine Image. His height was from east to west, as it is said, «Thou hast beset me behind and before». «Behind» refers to the west, «before» refers to the east. All the creatures saw him and became afraid of him, thinking that he was their Creator, and they came to prostrate themselves before him.[48]

In the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* 6–12, the same tradition is repeated in a virtually identical form:

> ...God then called Gabriel, and said unto him: «Go and bring Me dust from the four corners of the earth, and I will create man out of it».... He [Adam] stood upon his feet, and was in the likeness of God; his height extended from the east to the west, as it is said, «Behind and in front Thou hast formed me». Behind, that is the west, and in front, that is the east. All creatures saw him and were afraid of him; they thought he was their creator, and prostrated themselves before him.[49]

The testimonies from *Midrash Rabbah*, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* and the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* demonstrate that in the Jewish materials the anagram tradition was consistently interpreted as a reference to the cosmic body of the protoplast, created from one end of the universe to the other. In light of this tendency, it is possible that the tradition about the anagram found in *2 Enoch* 30 also represents a reference to the cosmic body of the protoplast. This suggestion is made more plausible when one considers that the anagram tradition in *2 Enoch* 30:13 follows immediately after the definition of the protoplast as a great celestial creature.[50]

---

[47] The importance of this motif for *2 Enoch's* traditions will be discussed later.

[48] Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer / Tr. G. Friedländer (New York, 1965) 76–79.

[49] The Chronicles of Jerahmeel / Tr. M. Gaster (London, 1899) (Oriental Translation Fund, 4) 14–17.

[50] Another tradition found in chapter 30 about the creation of Adam from the seven components might also serve as an allusion to the cosmic body of the protoplast. The description found in *2 Enoch* 30:8 relates that Adam's flesh was created from earth; his blood from dew and from the sun; his eyes from the bottomless sea; his bones from stone; his reason from the mobility of angels and from clouds; his veins and hair from the grass of the earth; his spirit from the Lord's spirit and from wind. It is possible that by such postulations the text intends to stress that the primor

The Measure of the Divine Body

As has been already mentioned in the introduction, *2 Enoch* 39 depicts the Lord's body as a huge extent «without measure and without analogy». While the text unambiguously states that the Lord's extent transcends any analogy, the account of Enoch's vision of the Lord seems in itself to represent a set of analogies in which the descriptions of the patriarch's face and the parts of his body are compared with the descriptions of the divine face and the parts of the Lord's body.

Several details in this narrative are important for establishing the connection between *2 Enoch's* account and the later Jewish traditions about the divine body.

1. It is significant that, through the analogical descriptions introduced in chapter 39 for the first time in the Enochic tradition, a significant bond was established between the immense body of the Lord and Enoch's body; this bond will later play a prominent role in Merkabah mysticism. In *2 Enoch*, as with later Merkabah developments, the proximity between the two bodies appears also to be reinforced by additional metaphors. These metaphors are intended to demonstrate the closeness between the corporeality of the Deity and the Enoch-Metatron corporeality.[51] From the Merkabah materials one can learn that «the hand of God rests on the head of the youth, named Metatron».[52] In *2 Enoch* 39:5 the patriarch uses a similar metaphor when he tells his children that he has seen the right hand of the Lord helping (beckoning)[53] him.[54]

---

dial Adam was the creature of macrocosmic dimensions since Adam's creation from the seven elements refers to Adam as a microcosm, e.g. the anthropomorphic representation of the world. The motif of creation from the seven elements might also be linked to the traditions associated with *Shi'ur Qomah* mysticism. The previously mentioned passage from the *Apocryphon of John*, where the *seven* powers create the seven «souls» of Adam might shed additional light on *2 Enoch's* account of Adam's creation from the *seven* elements.

[51] Ithamar Gruenwald observes that «it is hard to say whether any method lies behind these measures, but we assume that originally the measures aimed at conveying the notion of ideal proportions. These proportions were shared by God and man alike». Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism… 214.

[52] *Synopse* § 384.

[53] The same imagery can be found in Ezekiel the Tragedian's *Exagoge* 72: «Upon it sat a man of noble mien, becrowned, and with a scepter in one hand while with the other he did beckon me…». R. G. Robertson, Ezekiel the Tragedian // OTP. Vol. 1. 812.

[54] Cf. also *2 Enoch* 24:2 (the shorter recension). «And the Lord called me; and he placed me to the left of himself closer than Gabriel». Andersen, 2 Enoch… 143.

2. In the Merkabah materials the divine corporeality is labeled as the Measure of the Body[55] (שיעור קומה). The same terminology is often applied to Enoch-Metatron's body. According to one of the Merkabah texts, «the stature (קומתו) of this youth fills the world».[56] The link between the body of the patriarch and the divine body in the Slavonic apocalypse is also emphasized by identical terminology. It, therefore, comes as no surprise that in *2 Enoch* the *Shi'ur Qomah* terminology is applied, not only to the body of the Lord (the stature[57] of the Lord), but also to the body of the patriarch (stature of my [Enoch's] body).

3. In *2 Enoch* 39, Enoch's body seems to serve as the measure and the analogy through which the patriarch conveys to his children the immeasurability of the Lord's stature. In *2 Enoch* 39:6 the term *without measure*[58] (Slav. **бєзмѣрно**) is used immediately after the expression «the *stature*[59] of the Lord».[60] This conflation of the concepts of «stature» and «measure» further strengthens G. Scholem's hypothesis that *2 Enoch* 39 might attest to the precise *Shi'ur Qomah* terminology, since the term שיעור can be translated as a measure.[61]

---

[55] G. Scholem observes that the term *qomah* was often translated as «height» («Measurement of the Height»), used in the Biblical sense. He stresses that such translation does not apply to the Merkabah materials where *qomah*, like in the Aramaic incantation texts, signifies «body». Cf. G. Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (New York, 1954) 364.

[56] Schäfer et al., Synopse… 162.

[57] Slav. **ѡбѣтїа**, **ѡбѣатиє**. Соколов, Материалы и заметки… 1.38, 1.94.

[58] Some *Shi'ur Qomah* descriptions also stress the idea of the immesurability of the Divine Face: «...The image of His face and the image of His cheeks is as the dimensions of the spirit and as the creation of the soul, such that no one can recognize it, as it is stated (in Scripture): "His body is *tarshish*". His splendor is luminous and glows from within the darkness, and (from within) the cloud and fog that surround Him and although they surround Him, all the princes of the Presence (supplicate) before Him as (obediently as water flows when it is poured from) a water-pitcher, because of the vision of His comeliness and beauty. There is no measurement (מדה) in our hands; the names (alone) are revealed». Cohen, The Shi'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions... 47.

[59] Slav. **ѡбѣатиє** (**ѡбѣтїа**) literally can be translated as «embrace». This noun is related to the Slavonic verb — to embrace somebody, to fold somebody in one's hands. Francis Andersen translates the term as «scope» (the longer recension) and «extent» (the shorter recension).

[60] *2 Enoch* 39:6 «…I have seen the stature of the Lord, without measure and without analogy…».

[61] Markus Jastrow translates the term as «proportion», «standart», «definite quantity», «size», or «limit». M. Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature. 2 vols. (New York, 1967) Vol. 2. 1565.

4. It is also important that the message about the impossibility of measuring[62] the Lord's body comes from the mouth of Enoch, depicted in various sections of *2 Enoch* as a measurer responsible for measuring various earthly and celestial phenomena.[63] It demonstrates a remarkable parallel to the later role of Metatron as the one who conveys to visionaries the measure/the stature of the Body. In the *Shiʿur Qomah* section of the *Merkavah Rabbah*, the following tradition is attested: «I said to him, to the Prince of Torah,[64] teach me the measure of our Creator, and he said to me the measure of our Creator, and he said to me the measure of the body (שיעור קומה)». (*Synopse* § 688).[65] In later Jewish mysticism Enoch-Metatron himself is described as the measure[66] of the divine body.

In the conclusion of this section, it should be stressed that our analysis of the description of the Lord's corporeality in chapter 39 indicates that several features of this account manifest remarkable similarities to the concepts and imagery of the divine body found in the later Hekhalot and Merkabah writings. The development detectable in the Slavonic apocalypse, however, seems to represent a very early form of this tradition, which contains a vague sketch of what will take its definitive form in Jewish mysticism much later.

Bodily Ascent

It has been previously mentioned that Enoch's image in *2 Enoch* appears to be quite different from his portrait in the early Enochic circle. Among the new features that constitute this new enhanced profile of the seventh antede-

[62] The stress on the immesurability of God in *2 Enoch* does not contradict the theology of the *Shiʿur Qomah* tradition. Peter Schäfer observes that «the *Shiʿur Qomah* tradition does not intend to state that God can be 'calculated,' that he is, so to speak, a superman of enormous yet exactly measurable and conceivable dimensions … the completely absurd calculations is to demonstrate that God cannot be conceived of in human categories: he, 'as it were,' is like a human being and yet hidden». P. Schäfer, The Hidden and Manifest God. Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism / Tr. A. Pomerance (Albany, 1992) 149–150.

[63] See, for example, *2 Enoch* 40:2–12: «I know everything, and everything I have written down in books, the heavens and their boundaries and their contents. And all the armies and their movements I have measured. And I have recorded the stars and the multitude of multitudes innumerable… The solar circle I have measured, and its rays I have measured… The lunar circle I have measured, and its movements... I measured all the earth, and its mountains and hills and fields and woods and stones and rivers, and everything that exist...». Andersen, 2 Enoch… 164–166.

[64] = Metatron.

[65] Schäfer et al, Synopse… 252.

[66] G. G. Stroumsa, Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ // *HTR* 76 (1983) 269–288.

luvian patriarch, a significant one can be found that seems related to our ongoing discussion about the cosmic body traditions in the Slavonic apocalypse. This important feature appears in the first chapter of *2 Enoch*, which describes the beginning of Enoch's celestial ascent.

In *2 Enoch* 1:3 the reader finds the patriarch sleeping on his bed. According to the text Enoch sees a strange dream in which two huge angelic beings, with faces like the shining sun, approach the patriarch's bed and call him by his name. The text says that after the patriarch was awakened by the angels, he went out from his house closing the door behind him as the angels had ordered. Philip Alexander draws the reader's attention to an important detail in this description; he observes that *2 Enoch* «attests with a boldness and clarity nowhere matched in *1 Enoch* that Enoch ascended bodily to heaven...».[67] He also notes that this emphasis on the bodily ascent in the awakened condition represents a departure from the early Enochic materials attested in *1 (Ethiopic) Enoch*, where the patriarch's ascension to heaven seems to be depicted as in a dream during sleep.[68] Alexander further observes that this unequivocal claim that a human could bodily enter the upper realm was profoundly problematic within the worldview of early Judaism.[69]

It is intriguing that the later Merkabah Enochic accounts, as with *2 Enoch*'s account, insist on the bodily ascension of the patriarch. Alexander observes that, *3 Enoch* «clearly envisages bodily ascent and so postulates the physical metamorphosis of Enoch» during which Enoch «becomes, like other angels, physically composed of fire».[70] Alexander also points to another consequence of this metamorphosis, namely, the enlargement of Metatron's body until it equaled the dimensions of the world.[71]

This connection between the bodily ascent of the visionary and the transformation of his body in *2 Enoch* and the *Sefer Hekhalot* is not coincidental, since in the Slavonic apocalypse, for the first time in the Enochic tradition as we saw earlier, the body of the patriarch becomes a locus of intense theological deliberation. As has been already demonstrated in the *Shi*ᶜ*ur Qomah* passage from *2 Enoch* 39, the patriarch's body was explicitly compared with the divine body and linked with it by identical technical terminology. The

[67] Alexander, From Son of Adam to Second God... 104.

[68] Ibid. 103.

[69] Ibid. 102. It should be noted that despite the fact that *1 Enoch's* materials do not attest to the bodily ascent of the visionary, the transition to this concept occurred in early Judaism not later than the first century CE. Besides *2 Enoch's* evidence, which can be dated to the first century CE, before the destruction of the Second Temple, the Pauline passage attested in 2 Cor 12 also demonstrates familiarity with the concept of the bodily ascent. I am indebted to Alan Segal for this clarification.

[70] Ibid. 106.

[71] Ibid.

insistence on the bodily ascent of the patriarch in *2 Enoch* seems also to constitute an important step in the forming of this new perspective on Enoch's physique, the development that reached its formative stage in the later Merkabah speculations about Metatron's body matching the size of the world.

Adam and Enoch: «Two Powers» in Heaven

Previous studies proposed that the traditions about the cosmic body of Metatron in later Jewish mysticism might have originated as a result of the polemics with the traditions about the cosmic body of the protoplast. Thus, Philip Alexander, in his comment on the motif of Enoch-Metatron enlargement in *3 Enoch* 9, refers to certain rabbinic traditions[72] about «the primordial Adam's body, like that of the Gnostic protoanthropos, [which] corresponded to the world in size, but was diminished to the present limited dimensions of the human body as a result of the fall».[73] He further suggests that *3 Enoch*'s account about the gigantic body of Enoch-Metatron «maybe expressing in mythological language the idea that Enoch reversed the fall of Adam».[74]

Moshe Idel's research also reveals that «Jewish mystical literature indicates ... a certain similarity between the enlarged states of Adam and Enoch».[75] He notes that «the end of the gigantic Adam is well-known: he was severely reduced in his human dimensions. Enoch, on the other hand, merited undergoing the reverse process» described in *3 Enoch* as the patriarch's elevation and elongation as the measure of the length and breadth of the world.[76]

Idel notes that in some rabbinic materials the conception of the elevated Enoch, depicted as the supreme angel Metatron, contains remnants of the Adamic traditions.[77] In these materials Enoch is conceived as the one who regained the cosmic status and the extraordinary qualities that the primordial Adam had lost after his transgression in the Garden of Eden, namely, his luminosity and size.[78]

Moreover, in some rabbinic accounts Metatron is often directly described as a counterpart of Adam predestined to substitute for the fallen patriarch

[72] In *Gen. R.* 8:1, *b.* Hag. 12a, and possibly, in *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* 1:1.

[73] Alexander, From Son of Adam to a Second God... 111–112.

[74] Ibid. 112.

[75] Idel, Enoch is Metatron... 225.

[76] Ibid. 225.

[77] Ibid. 220.

[78] Cf. *b.* Sanh. 38b: «Rab Judah said in Rab's name: The first man reached from one end of the world to the other... R. Elezar said: The first man reached from earth to heaven... but when he sinned, the Holy One, blessed be He, laid His hand upon him and diminished him...». The Babylonian Talmud (Hebrew-English Edition) Sanhedrin / Trs. J. Shachter, H. Freedman (London, 1994) 38b.

even before his actual transgression.[79] Idel points[80] to the development of this theme in *3 Enoch*. The *Sefer Hekhalot* 48C reads:

> The Holy One, blessed be he, said: I made him strong, I took him, I appointed him, namely Metatron my servant, who is unique among all denizens of the heights. «I made him strong» in the generation of the first man...». I took him» — Enoch the son of Jared, from their midst, and brought him up... «I appointed him» — over all the storehouses and treasures which I have in every heaven...[81]

According to this passage God elected Metatron already in the generation of the first man. Metatron was thus viewed as a preexistent divine being,[82] first incarnated in Adam and then in Enoch, who re-ascended to the protoplast's heavenly home and took his rightful place in the heights of the universe.[83] Our research will later demonstrate that in *2 Enoch* the account of Enoch's elevation, similarly to this Metatron tradition, is juxtaposed with the story of the elevated prelapsarian Adam. Idel also observes that in Jewish mystical literature another significant parallelism in the depictions of the corporalities of Adam and Enoch can be detected. He points out that in both cases «their immense size caused an error of faith, namely other creatures were induced to believe that two powers governed the universe, not God alone».[84]

---

[79] Isaiah Tishby observes that in both the *Raya Mehemna* and the *Tikkunei ha-Zohar*, Metatron is portrayed as the lord of the lower chariot, a human figure seated upon the throne; and in this role he is called «the lesser Adam». Tishby notes that according to the *Tikkunei ha-Zohar* «...Metatron was created first and foremost among all the hosts of heaven below, and he is the lesser Adam, which the Holy One, blessed be He, made in the celestial image». I. Tishby, The Wisdom of the Zohar. 3 vols. (London, 1994) Vol. 2. 628–629. In some Zoharic materials Metatron's name(s), similar to Adam's name, are also juxtaposed with the tradition about the four corners of the world: «This is Metatron, which is higher [than the creatures] by a distance of five hundred years. Metatron, Mitatron, Zevul, Eved, Zevoel — here are five [names], and *his names multiply in four directions to the four corners of the world* according to the missions of his Master». Ibid. 643.

[80] Idel, Enoch is Metatron... 226.

[81] Alexander, 3 Enoch... 311.

[82] Scholem argued that in the Metatron lore one can find two possible concepts of this angel. The first one considers him as an angelic counterpart of the seventh antediluvian patriarch translated to heaven before the Flood and transfigured into an immortal angelic being. He argued that there was also another trend in which Metatron was not connected with Enoch or any other human prototype but was understood as a pre-existent angel. See G. Scholem, Kabbalah (New York, 1987) 378–380.

[83] It is noteworthy that the motif of Enoch as the redeemer and the restorer of prelapsarian humanity can be traced to *2 Enoch* 64:4–5 where the patriarch is portrayed as the one who carried away the sin of humankind. Andersen, 2 Enoch... 190.

[84] Idel, Enoch is Metatron... 225.

Several rabbinic and Hekhalot sources, including *b*. Hag. 15a, *Sefer Hekhalot* 16, and *Merkavah Rabbah* (*Synopse* § 672) attest to a tradition according to which the terrifying vision of Metatron, seated on a great throne at the door of the seventh palace, caused Aher to believe that Metatron represents the second power in heaven.

In *3 Enoch* 16:1–5 Enoch-Metatron tells to Rabbi Ishmael the following story:

> At first I sat upon a great throne at the door of the seventh palace, and I judged all the denizens of the heights on the authority of the Holy One, blessed be he... I sat in the heavenly court. The princes of kingdoms stood beside me, to my right and to my left, by authority of the Holy One, blessed be he. But when Aher came to behold the vision of the chariot and set eyes upon me, he was afraid and trembled before me. His soul was alarmed to the point of leaving him, because of his fear, dread, and terror of me, when he saw me seated[85] upon a throne like king, with ministering angels standing beside me as servants and all the princes of kingdoms crowned with crowns surrounding me.[86]

Despite the prominent role that Enoch-Metatron plays in the «two powers» controversy, the initial background of this tradition about the erroneous veneration of the exalted humanity appears to originate, not in the Enochic, but in the Adamic tradition.[87]

Jarl Fossum's research demonstrates that the motif of the misplaced adoration of Adam by the angels appears in several forms in the rabbinic literature.[88] Thus, from *Gen. R.* 8:10 one can learn that when God created man in

[85] The rabbinic tradition states that there is no sitting in heaven, where according to *b*. Hag. 15a, the privilege of «seating» beside God was accorded solely to Metatron by virtue of his character as a «scribe»; for he was granted permission as a scribe to sit and write down the merits of Israel. It is important that the motif of the «seating» of Enoch-Metatron in heaven is first documented in *2 Enoch* 23:4 where the archangel Vereveil allows the patriarch to sit down and «write everything».

[86] Alexander, 3 Enoch… 268.

[87] For Adam's connection with the two powers' traditions, see Segal's pioneering research: A. Segal, Two Powers in Heaven. Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism (Leiden, 1977) (SJLA, 25) 108–115.

[88] Jarl Fossum differentiates three major forms of this tradition: «(1) The angels mistake Adam for God and want to exclaim 'Holy' before him, whereupon God lets sleep fall upon Adam so it becomes clear that the latter is human; (2) all creatures mistake Adam for their creator and wish to bow before him, but Adam teaches them to render all honor to God as their true creator; (3) the angels mistake Adam for God and wish to exclaim 'Holy' before him, whereupon God reduces Adam's size». J. Fossum, The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis // Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion… Vol. 1. 529–30. An important similarity can be detected between these Adamic traditions and the Metatron accounts. In *b*. Hag. 15a God punish-

his own image «the ministering angels mistook him [for a divine being] and wished to exclaim "Holy" before Him... What did the Holy One, blessed be He, do? He caused sleep to fall upon him, and so all knew that he was [only a mortal] man».[89] In the *Alphabet of R. Akiba* the angels' erroneous behavior is explained through the reference to Adam's gigantic body:[90]

> This teaches that initially Adam was created from the earth to the firmament. When the ministering angels saw him, they were shocked and excited by him. At that time they all stood before the Holy One, blessed be He, and said to Him; «Master of the Universe! There are two powers in the world, one in heaven and one on earth». What did the Holy One, blessed be He, do then? He placed His hand on him, and decreased him,[91] setting him at one thousand cubits.[92]

It is clear that these Adamic accounts do not originate in the rabbinic literature under the influence of Metatron's story but in early pseudepigraphical writings. Scholars observe[93] that these accounts have their roots in the prominent story already found in the primary Adam books[94] and other early

ed Metatron with sixty fiery lashes. Alan Segal observes that «just as Metatron needed correction for the false impression he gave Aher, so Adam needs correction for the false impression given the angels». Segal, Two Powers in Heaven… 112. Indeed, in the Adamic accounts of two powers the protoplast is disciplined in various ways, including the reduction of his stature.

[89] Midrash Rabbah… Vol. 1. 61.

[90] It should be noted that the traditions about the gigantic body of Adam were widespread in the rabbinic literature. See: A. Altmann, The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends // *JQR* 35 (1945) 371–391; B. Barc, La taille cosmique d'Adam dans la littérature juive rabbinique des trois premiers siècles apres J.-C. // *RSR* 49 (1975) 173–185; Fossum, The Adorable Adam of the Mystics… 529–539; S. Niditch, The Cosmic Adam: Man as Mediator in Rabbinic Literature // *JJS* 34 (1983) 137–146; P. Schäfer, Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorstellung (Berlin, 1975) (SJ, 8); Segal, Two Powers in Heaven… 108–115.

[91] *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* 1:1 reflects the same tradition: «Said R. Aibu, "At that moment the first man's stature was cut down and diminished to one hundred cubits"». Pesiqta de Rab Kahana / Tr. J. Neusner. 2 vols. (Atlanta, 1987) (BJS, 122–123) Vol. 1. 1.

[92] Idel, Enoch is Metatron… 226.

[93] Altmann, The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends… 382; Fossum, The Adorable Adam of the Mystics… 530–531.

[94] The account of Adam's elevation and his veneration by angels is also found in Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve* 13–15. These versions depict God's creation of Adam in his image. The first man was then brought before God's face by the archangel Michael to bow down to God. God commanded all the angels to bow down to Adam. All the angels agreed to venerate the protoplast, except Satan (and his angels) who refused to bow down before Adam, because the first human was «younger» than («posterior» to) Satan.

materials,[95] according to which God himself ordered the angels to venerate Adam, and all the angels except Satan bowed before the first human.

The prototype of the story of the misplaced veneration of Enoch-Metatron also can be traced to this early Adamic lore. It is possible that the transition from the Adamic two powers template to the Enoch-Metatron two powers template occurred not in the rabbinic period but much earlier, that is, already inside the Second Temple Judaism. M. Stone has demonstrated that in *2 Enoch* 22 the Adamic tradition of the protoplast's veneration by the angels was skillfully transferred to the seventh antediluvian patriarch.[96] It is not coincidental that the transference of the «two powers» tradition from Adam to Enoch was made for the first time in the Slavonic Apocalypse where the protoplast and the seventh antediluvian patriarch were interconnected via the conception of the cosmic body.

Two Bodies Created According to the Likeness of the Third One

Our previous analysis has shown that in the various Jewish texts the traditions about Adam's and Enoch's corporalities often appear to be linked and share similar imagery. Our investigation has also demonstrated that this connection can be detected already in *2 Enoch*. A critical question, however, still remains: how can these traditions about the corporealities of the two patriarchs be related to the *Shiʿur Qomah* account of the Divine Face found in chapter 39.

It appears that the depiction of the divine anthropomorphic extent, labeled in *2 Enoch* as the Lord's Face, serves as an important locus that unifies the Adamic tradition of the cosmic body of the protoplast and the Enochic tradition about the glorious angelic body of the translated patriarch. Our re-

[95] The Slavonic version of *3 Baruch* 4; *Gospel of Bartholomew* 4, Coptic *Enthronement of Michael*, *Cave of Treasures* 2:10–24, and *Qur'an* 2:31–39; 7:11–18; 15:31–48; 17:61–65; 18:50; 20:116–123; 38:71–85.

[96] M. Stone's article investigates an important motif preserved in chapters 21–22 of the Slavonic apocalypse. He observes that the story found in *2 Enoch* 21–22 recalls the account of Adam's elevation and his veneration by angels found in Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve*. Stones notes that, besides the motifs of Adam's elevation and his veneration by angels, the author of *2 Enoch* appears to be also aware of the motif of angelic disobedience and refusal to venerate the first human. M. Stone draws the reader's attention to the phrase «sounding them out», found in *2 Enoch* 22:6, which another translator of the Slavonic text rendered as «making a trial of them». Stone notes that the expressions «sounding them out» or «making a trial of them» imply here that it is the angels' obedience that is being tested. Cf. M. E. Stone, The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve* // *JTS* 44 (1993) 143–156.

search must now turn to the analysis of the accounts of the Divine Face which unifies both traditions.

It should be noted that *2 Enoch* contains two descriptions involving the motif of the Divine Face. The first one occurs in *2 Enoch* 22, a chapter which depicts Enoch's encounter with the Lord in the celestial realm. The second account appears in chapter 39 where the patriarch reports his initial theophanic experience to his sons during his short visit to earth, adding some new details. Although both descriptions demonstrate a number of terminological affinities, the second account explicitly connects the Divine Face with the Lord's anthropomorphic «extent». It is also significant that in both theophanic descriptions the stature of the Lord, His «Face», is associated with light and fire. In biblical theophanies smoke and fire often serve as a divine envelope that protects mortals from the sight of the Divine Form. Radiant luminosity emitted by the Deity fulfills the same function, indicating the danger of the direct vision of the divine form. Luminosity also represents the screen which protects the Deity from the necessity of revealing its true form. Scholars note that in some theophanic traditions God's form remains hidden behind His light.[97] The hidden *Kavod* is revealed through this light, which serves as a luminous screen, «the face» of this anthropomorphic extent. *2 Enoch's* theophanies, which use the metaphors of light and fire, may well be connected with such traditions where the Divine «Form» is hidden behind the incandescent «face», which covers and protects the sovereignty of the Lord.[98]

In *2 Enoch* 39:3–6 the «face» is closely associated with the divine «extent» and seems to be understood, not simply as a part of the Lord's body, but as a radiant *façade* of His whole anthropomorphic «stature». This identification between the Lord's face and the Lord's form is reinforced by an additional parallel in which Enoch's face is identified with Enoch's form. The association between the Divine Face and the Divine Form in *2 Enoch* 39:3–6 closely resembles the biblical tradition from Ex 33:18–23, where the divine *panim* is mentioned in connection with the glorious Divine form, God's *Kavod*.

The motif of the Divine Face has paramount significance for our investigation since it serves as a symbol decisively linking Enoch's newly acquired

[97] April De Conick's pioneering research shows that in Enochic traditions God's form remains hidden behind his light. Cf. A. De Conick, Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas (Leiden, 1996) (SVC, 33) 104–105.

[98] The imagery of the divine Face plays an important role in Merkabah mysticism. In the *Hekhalot Rabbati* the following descriptions can be found: «...the holy living creatures ... put on garments of fire and wrap themselves in a covering of flame, and cover their faces with a lighting bolt, and the Holy One, blessed be He, unveils His face». *Synopse*, § 184. «The honored King is enthroned and He rises up the living creatures... They embrace Him and they kiss Him and they unveil their faces. They unveil themselves and the King of Glory covers His face, and the Arabot firmament used to burst like a sieve before the face of the King». *Synopse*, § 189.

luminous angelic body with the glorious body of the protoplast. Enoch's luminous metamorphosis takes place in the front of the Lord's glorious «extent», labeled in *2 Enoch* as the Lord's «Face». From *2 Enoch* 22 one can learn that the vision of the divine «Face» had drastic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endures radical changes as it becomes covered with the divine light. This encounter transforms Enoch into a glorious angelic being. The text says that after this procedure Enoch had become like one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference.[99] This phrase describes Enoch's transition to his new celestial identity as «one of the glorious ones». During this transition in the front of the Lord's face Enoch's own «face» has been radically altered and the patriarch has now acquired a new glorious «visage» which reflects the luminosity[100] of the Lord's *Panim*.[101] The account of the Lord's Face in *2 Enoch* 39 also stresses the proximity between the Face and the patriarch's body. It is expressed through a series of analogical comparisons that demonstrates that Enoch's new transformed stature is fashioned in the *likeness* of the Lord's «Face».

This creation in the likeness of the Lord's Face represents an important link that connects this new angelic body of Enoch with the body of the glorious Adam. It has been demonstrated that the Face in *2 Enoch* 22 represented the cause and the prototype after which the new celestial identity of Enoch

[99] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 139.

[100] *2 Enoch's* narrative gives evidence that Enoch's face acquired the same qualities of luminosity as the Face of the Lord. In *2 Enoch* 37, the Lord calls one of his angels to chill the face of Enoch before his return to earth. The angel, who «appeared frozen», then chilled Enoch's face with his icy hands. Immediately after this procedure, the Lord tells Enoch that if his face had not been chilled in such a way, no human being would be able to look at his face. This chilling procedure indicates that Enoch's metamorphosis near the Face involves the transformation of the visionary's face into the fiery, perilous entity which now resembles the Lord's Face. We can find a detailed description of this process in another «Enochic» text, the *Sefer Hekhalot*, which describes the transformation of Enoch-Metatron, the Prince of the Divine Presence, into a fiery creature. Cf. *3 Enoch* 15:1 «R. Ishmael said: The angel Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, the glory of highest heaven, said to me: When the Holy One, blessed be he, took me to serve the throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all needs of the Shekinah, at once my flesh turned to flame, my sinews to blazing fire, my bones to juniper coals, my eyelashes to lightning flashes, my eyeballs to fiery torches, the hairs of my head to hot flames, all my limbs to wings of burning fire, and the substance of my body to blazing fire». Alexander, 3 Enoch… 267.

[101] It is noteworthy that after this procedure Enoch's «face» itself, similar to the Lord's face, acquired the ability to glorify other subjects. Thus, in *2 Enoch* 64:3–5 the following tradition can be found: «...and the elders of the people and all the community came and prostrated themselves and kissed Enoch... O our father Enoch, bless your sons and all the people, so that we may be glorified in front of your face today». Andersen, 2 Enoch… 190.

was «created». The new creation fashioned after the Face signifies here the return to the prelapsarian condition of Adam, who according to the Slavonic apocalypse was also «modeled» during his creation after the Face of God. In *2 Enoch* 44:1 one can learn that the protoplast was created in the likeness of God's Face. The text says that «the Lord with his own two hands created mankind; in a facsimile of *his own face*, both small and great, the Lord created [them]».[102] It is intriguing that *2 Enoch* departs here from the canonical reading attested in Gen 1:26–27, where Adam was created, not after the face of God, but after His image (*tselem*). In view of this departure, the author of the recent English translation of the Slavonic apocalypse, Francis Andersen, observes that *2 Enoch*'s «idea is remarkable from any point of view... This is not the original meaning of *tselem*... The text uses *podobie lica* [in the likeness of the face], not *obrazu* or *videnije*, the usual terms for "image"».[103]

The previous analysis, however, demonstrates that this reading does not arise in the Slavonic environment but belongs to the original argument of *2 Enoch*, where the creation of the luminous protoplast after the Face of the Lord corresponds to a similar angelic «creation» of the seventh antediluvian patriarch. There is almost no doubt that, in view of the information about Adam's glorious angelic nature attested in *2 Enoch* 30:11, the author of the Slavonic apocalypse tries to connect the theme of Adam's creation with the motif of the glorious Face of the Lord.

This connection also reveals that the bodies of the two characters of the Slavonic apocalypse, the prelapsarian corporeality of the protoplast and the body of his luminous counterpart, the patriarch Enoch, are both fashioned in the likeness of the third body, namely, the extent of the Lord, also known as the luminous «Face». It is not coincidental that in *2 Enoch* the interconnection of all three corporealities, the glorious body of the protoplast, the glorious body of the elevated Enoch, and the luminous divine body, is made via the account of the Divine Face where, according to Gershom Scholem, the precise *Shi^cur Qomah* terminology might have already been made evident.

[102] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 170.

[103] Ibid. 171, note b.

ABSTRACT

The artice investigates the origins of the *Shiᶜur Qomah* tradition. This tradition depicts visionaries, Rabbi Ishmael and Rabbi Akiba, receiving from the supreme angel Metatron revelations of the «measurement of the body» (in Hebrew, *Shiᶜur Qomah*), an anthropomorphic description of the Deity together with the mystical names of its gigantic limbs. Although the majority of the evidence of the the *Shiᶜur Qomah* tradition survived in late Jewish writings, Gershom Scholem argued that the beginning of *Shiᶜur Qomah* speculations can be found in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* where one can find the description of the appearance of the Lord as a terrifying extent analogous to the human form. The article develops Scholem's hypothesis arguing that the traditions about the divine body in *2 Enoch* were shaped by the early Adamic traditions. The portrayal of the prelapsarian Adam found in the longer recension of *2 Enoch* reveals fascinating similarities to the later *Shiᶜur Qomah* descriptions.

Silviu N. Bunta
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

TOO VAST TO FIT IN THE WORLD: MOSES, ADAM, AND צלם אלהים IN THE *TESTAMENT OF MOSES* 11:8

No research has yet been dedicated to *Testament of Moses* 11:8.[1] Scholarly interest in Moses' portrayal in the testament has been limited to chapter 1 (in which Moses is presumably depicted as pre-existent), 11:16–17 (in which Moses is apparently attributed prophetic and angelomorphic titles), and just recently to 10:2.[2] Only scarcely and tangentially has 11:8 received any attention in the broad commentaries on the whole book. The purpose of this article is to analyze 11:8 in its textual, contextual, and intertextual aspects. It consequently argues that the verse depicts Moses as a physically enormous being in the context and in the language of contemporary (i.e. first century C.E.) speculations about Adam's enormous size.

The text of *Testament of Moses* is extant in its entirety only in a sixth century Latin palimpsest discovered in 1861 by A. M. Ceriani.[3] While most of the first editors and researchers concluded that the Latin version is a translation of an original Greek text, today almost universally[4] scholars agree that the Greek stratum at the basis of the Latin version is itself a translation of a Semitic original, Hebrew or Aramaic.[5] In 1868 A. Hilgen-

[1] I am very much indebted to Prof. Andrei Orlov for his comments and suggestions in regard to this article. Any errors that remain are, of course, my responsability alone.

[2] J. W. van Henten, Moses as Heavenly Messenger in *Assumptio Mosis* 10:2 and Qumran Passages // *JJS* 54 (2003) 216–227.

[3] Most scholars agree that the most probable date for *Testament of Moses* is the first century C.E. For investigations of this consensus, see J. Tromp, The Assumption of Moses. A Critical Edition with Commentary (Leiden—New York—Köln, 1993) (SVTP 10) 93–96, 116–117; J. Priest, Testament of Moses // OTP. Vol. 1. 919–934, here pp. 920–921; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Introduction // Studies on the Testament of Moses / Ed. J. H. Charlesworth (Cambridge, MA., 1973) 5–14; J. H. Charlesworth, An Antiochan Date for the *Testament of Moses* // Studies on the Testament of Moses… 33–37; J. J. Collins, The Date and Provenance of the *Testament of Moses* // Studies on the Testament of Moses… 15–32; J. J. Collins, Some Remaining Traditio-Historical Problems in the *Testament of Moses* // Studies on the Testament of Moses… 38–43.

[4] A most notable dissent is Tromp, The Assumption of Moses… 85.

[5] For analyses of the opinions about the original language of the text and its transmission, see R. H. Charles, The Assumption of Moses (London, 1897) XXXVI–

feld attempted to reconstruct the Greek stratum by retroverting the Latin text into Greek.[6]

The text of 11: 8 is unclear and peculiar:

> *Omnibus enim morientibus secus aetatem sepulturae suae sunt in terris; nam tua sepultura ab oriente sole usque ad occidentem, et ab austro usque ad fines aquilonis. Omnis orbis terrarum sepulcrum est tuum.*[7]

Charles translates the paragraph as follows:

> For all men when they die have according to their age their sepulchers on earth; but your sepulcher is from the rising to the setting sun, and from the south to the confines of the north: all the world is your sepulcher.[8]

This translation, as would any other attempt, captures only partially the vagueness and the peculiarity of the Latin text, which makes use of constructions, ambiguous terms, and a surprisingly complicated syntax.

The Text

Johannes Tromp has correctly noted in his critical edition and thorough analysis of the text that the meaning of the passage lies upon an exceptional problem, namely «the meaning and function of the words *secus aetatem*».[9] Tromp and most scholars agree that *secus aetatem* is in adjunction with *sepulturae suae sunt*.[10] Therefore the correct syntax is not «all who die when their time has come (i.e., *secus aetatem*) have a grave in the earth» (Tromp's actual translation), but, as Tromp himself admits, «all men when they die have their sepulchers in the earth according to their *aetas* (*secus aetatem*)». Moreover, *nam* also places *secus aetatem* in adjunction with *tua* (Moses') *sepultura* (*est*). In other words, Moses' *aetas* conditions his grave, or rather the inability to bury him. Tromp remarks this double adjunction of *secus aetatem* to both *sepulturae suae* and *tua sepultura*, and suggests that the correct paraphrase of the passage is: «One cannot bury you, because your *aetas* is so huge, that your grave should cover the entire world».[11]

XLV; E.-M. Laperrousaz, Le Testament de Moïse (Paris, 1970) (Semitica 19) 16–25; Tromp, The Assumption of Moses… 78–85; D. H. Wallace, The Semitic Origin of the Assumption of Moses // *TZ* 11 (1955) 321–328.

[6] A. Hilgenfeld, Die Psalmen Salomo's und die Himmelfahrt des Moses, griechisch hergestellt und erklärt. B. Die Himmelfahrt des Moses // *ZWT* 11 (1868) 273–309.

[7] The text is from Tromp's critical edition, The Assumption of Moses… 20. It is identical with the texts offered by Laperrousaz (Le Testament de Moïse… 61) and Charles (The Assumption of Moses… 90–92).

[8] Charles, The Assumption of Moses… 90–92.

[9] Tromp, The Assumption of Moses… 245.

[10] Idem. See also Charles' translation above.

[11] Idem.

Tromp also notes that the reading of *aetas* as «age», as *aetas* has been generally translated, does not make sense in the context. «Moses' age at the time of his death … was not extraordinarily high»,[12] and cannot constitute the enormous difference between him and other humans that the text claims on account of *aetas*. Moreover, age is not a factor in burials and certainly cannot be a reason that prevents a burial or, more precisely, makes it impossible, as the text claims about *aetas*. A different reading of *aetas* is not only possible, but also more probable and compliant to the semantic and syntactical requirements of the passage.

The mention in 11: 8bc of the four directions is spatial; it refers to spatial dimension. The text says that Moses' *aetas* is the reason for which, if he could have a grave, his grave would extend from east to west and from north to south, covering the whole world. Given the correlation between *aetas* and this spatial reference, the only syntactically possible meaning of *aetas* is dimensional. This suggests that A. Hilgenfeld's option for ἡλικία in his retroversion of the Latin text into Greek[13] is most probably correct. ἡλικία means not only «age», and therefore a Latin translator would render it with *aetas*, but it also refers to «stature», and this sense meets the syntactical requirement of a dimensional reference.

Eph 4:11–13 provides evidence that ἡλικία/*aetas* was part of the language of speculations about God's enormous corporeality as early as the first century C.E. The passage refers to «building up the body of Christ» to the «measure of the stature (εἰς μέτρον τῆς ἡλικίας)» of Christ. The Vulgate translates the expression with *in mensuram aetatis*. M. Fishbane remarks that the expression has an exact correspondent in the Hebrew שעור קומה and constitutes a case of Christian appropriation of early Jewish speculations about God's enormous body, of whom Adam's body is an image.[14] Eph 4:13 is also a biblical passage that early Christian anthropomorphites used in support of their claims regarding an enormous divine body, which is the body of the

[12] Tromp, The Assumption of Moses… 245.

[13] Hilgenfeld, Die Psalmen Salomo's… 294.

[14] M. Fishbane, The «Measures» of God's Glory in Ancient Midrash // Messiah and Christos / Ed. I. Gruenwald et al. (Tübingen, 1992) 53–74, esp. 70–72. G. Scholem remarks that a similar phrase exists in *2 Enoch* 39:6 (shorter recension) (On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead (New York, 1991) 29). For שעור קומה type speculations in the Pauline corpus, see also G. Quispel, Ezekiel 1: 26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis // *VC* 34 (1980) 1–13; G. Stroumsa, Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ // *HTR* 76 (1983) 269–288, esp. 281–286; A. Segal, Paul the Convert: the Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee (New Haven, 1990) 58–64; J. Fossum, Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism // *VC* 37 (1983) 260–287, esp. 261–274; C. R. A. Morray-Jones, The Temple Within. The Embodied Divine Image and Its Worship in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish and Christian Sources // *SBLSP* 37 (1998) 400–431, esp. 426–430.

Son, the new Adam.[15] There is also evidence that in Latin-speaking Christian circles *aetas* of Eph 4:13 was understood as a reference to bodily dimension. Thus in *De civitate Dei* 22.14–18, Augustine opposes a group of Christians that conceive the resurrected human body as of «gigantic proportions» (*giganteae magnitudines*), like, they say, the resurrected body of Christ. The group also professes openly an exegesis of Eph 4:13 that reads *aetas* as «body» (*corpus*) and *mensura aetatis* as *mensura corporis*. Augustine reminds this group that the meaning of the word is not «body», but «age»:

> As for what the apostle said of the measure of the age (*mensura aetatis*) of the fullness of Christ, we must either understand him to refer to something else [not to bodily size], to the fact that the measure of Christ will be completed when all the members among the Christian communities are added to the Head; or, if we are to refer it to the resurrection of the body, the meaning is that all shall rise neither beyond nor under youth, but in that vigor and age to which we know that Christ had arrived. For even the world's wisest men have fixed the bloom of youth at about the age of thirty; and when this period has been passed, the man begins to decline towards the defective and duller period of old age. And therefore the apostle did not speak of the measure of the body (*mensura corporis*), nor of the measure of the stature (*mensura staturae*), but of «the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ». (*Civ.* 22:15)[16]

[15] Anthropomorphic traditions are constantly and widely witnessed all over Christianity throughout the first four Christian centuries. For these widespread traditions, see G. Gould, The Image of God and the Anthropomorphite Controversy in Fourth Century Monasticism // Origeniana Quinta / Ed. B. Daley (Louvain, 1992) 549–557; G. Florovsky, The Anthropomorphites in the Egyptian Desert // idem, Collected Works. 14 vols. (Belmont, MA, 1972–1989) Vol. 4. 89–96; G. Stroumsa, The Incorporeality of God: Context and Implications of Origen's Position // *Religion* 13 (1983) 345–358; idem, Form(s) of God…; G. Stroumsa, Jewish and Gnostic Traditions among the Audians // Sharing the Sacred: Religious Contacts and Conflicts in the Holy Land / Ed. A. Kofsky, G. G. Stroumsa (Jerusalem, 1998) 345–358; D. Paulsen, Early Christian Belief in a Corporeal Deity: Origen and Augustine as Reluctant Witnesses // *HTR* 83 (1990) 105–116; A. Golitzin, «The Demons Suggest an Illusion of God's Glory in a Form»: Controversy over the Divine Body and Vision of Glory in Some Late Fourth, Early Fifth Century Monastic Literature // *StMon* 44 (2002) 13–43; A. Golitzin, The Vision of God and the Form of the Glory: More Reflections on the Anthropomorphite Controversy of 399 AD // Abba: The Tradition of Orthodoxy in the West. Festschrift for Bishop Kallistos of Diokleia / Ed. A. Louth, J. Behr (Crestwood, NY, 2003) 267–291. While Gould and Florovsky offer ample arguments against the presence of anthropomorphism, Stroumsa, Paulsen, and Golitzin make irrefutable arguments for it.

[16] The translation follows the one in Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Series 1. 14 vols. (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1956) Vol. 2. 495. For the Latin text I have used W. M. Green's edition in Saint Augustine, *The City of God Against the Pagans*. 7 vols. (Cambridge, MA—London 1972) (LCL) Vol. 7. 276, 278.

In its anthropomorphic readings the same group also associates Eph 4:13 with Rom 8:29, and interprets the conformity to «the image of the Son of God» as enlargement to the Son's enormous proportions. Augustine counters:

> But if we are also taught in these words what form our bodies shall rise in, as the measure we spoke of before, so also this conformity is to be understood not of size (*quantitas*), but of age (*aetas*). Accordingly all shall rise in the stature they either had attained or would have attained had they lived to their prime, although it will be no great disadvantage even if the form of the body be infantine or aged, while no infirmity shall remain in the mind nor in the body itself. So that even if any one contends that every person will rise again in the same bodily form in which he died, we need not spend much labor in disputing with him. (*Civ.* 22:16)[17]

The group that Augustine opposes so vehemently interprets *mensura aetatis* of Eph 4:13 both as «measure of the body» (*mensura corporis*) and as «measure of the stature» (*mensura staturae*). The expressions are equivalent.

Given this anthropomorphic connotation and history of *aetas*, it can be safely argued that a revised translation of *Testament of Moses* 11:8 should read «stature» for *aetas*, in complete awareness of its corporeal connotations and connection with Jewish שעור קומה speculations:

> For all dying men have their graves on earth according to their statures, but your grave is from the rising of the sun to the west, and from the south to the limits of the north. The whole world is your grave.

The Context

The reading of *aetas* as «stature» is supported by the reference to the four directions. Not inadvertently the four directions also occupy a central position in contemporary (i.e. first century C.E.) and earlier Jewish speculations about both the body and the name of Adam.

The Name of Adam

The third book of *Sibylline Oracles* is a composite pseudepigraphon written most probably in Egypt.[18] Verses 97–349, 489–829 are generally dated to the middle of the second century B.C.E.,[19] while verses 350–488 originate in

[17] *NPNF*[1], 2:495; Saint Augustine, *The City of God Against the Pagans*… Vol. 7. 278.

[18] For its composite nature, see J. J. Collins, The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism (Missoula, Mont., 1974) (SBLDS, 13) 21–34; idem, Sibylline Oracles // OTP. Vol. 1. 354–380; idem, Between Athens and Jerusalem (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2000[2]) 84. For its provenance, see Collins, Sibylline Oracles… 355–356; idem, Between Athens and Jerusalem… 87.

[19] Collins, Sibylline Oracles… 354–355; idem, Between Athens and Jerusalem… 85–86; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah:

the beginning of the second half of the first century B.C.E.[20] Verses 1–92 are a later introductive addition, probably a conclusion of a different sibylline book.[21] The date of this introduction could fall anywhere between the late Hellenistic period and the early Roman period, with the most probable date in the second half of the first century B.C.E.[22] This introduction contains an Adamic tradition that associates the name of the protoplast with the four directions:

> [24] Indeed it is God himself who fashioned Adam, of four letters,
> [25] the first-formed man, fulfilling by his name
> [26] east (ἀνατολή) and west (δύσις) and south (μεσημβρία) and north (ἄρκτος). (*Sib. Or.* 3:24–26)[23]

The speculation about Adam's name is based on the Greek names of the four directions: east-ἀνατολή, west-δύσις, north-ἄρκτος, and south-μεσημβρία. By means of acronym early Hellenistic Jewish circles discovered in the four words the name of Adam. Interestingly the text renders the Greek acronym the wrong way, namely ADMA, even if the mistake is so evident in the original Greek of the oracles and should not have skipped the eyes of the author. Intriguingly, this incorrect order corresponds perfectly to the sequence of the four directions in *Testament of Moses* 11:8.

The same speculation about the name of Adam is found in *2 Enoch* 30:11–14 (longer recension):

> [11] And on earth I assigned him (i.e. Adam) to be a second angel, honored, and great and glorious. [12] And I assigned him to be a king to reign on the earth and to have my wisdom. And there was nothing comparable to him on the earth, even among my creatures that exist. [13] And I assigned to him a name from the four components, from east A, from west D, from north A, from south M. [14] And I assigned to him four special stars, and called his name Adam. (*2 En.* 30:11–14 longer recension)[24]

A Historical and Literary Introduction (London, 1981) 161–165. For a bibliography on this dating, see Collins, Sibylline Oracles… 144. Slightly later dates have been proposed by V. Nikiprowetzky, La Troisième Sibylle (Paris, 1970) 215; A. Paul, Les Pseudépigraphes juifs de langue grecque // Études sur le Judaïsme hellénistique / Ed. R. Kuntzmann, J. Schlosser (Paris, 1984) 90.

[20] Collins, Sibylline Oracles… 358.

[21] Ibid. 354, 359–360.

[22] Ibid. 360.

[23] The translation is from Collins, Sibylline Oracles… 362.

[24] Ibid. 152. The passage has a strikingly close parallel (except for the mention of the four directions) in Philo, *De opificio mundi* 148. Like the Enochic passage, the Philonian reference follows a description of Adam's creation from elements of the earth (4 in Philo, 8 in *2 Enoch* 30:8), and an emphasis on man's dual spiritual-material nature (*Opif.* 136–139: «body» and «soul»; *2 En.* 30:10: «invisible and visible»). Like in the Enochic passage, in Philo Adam «surpasses all men» (140), has a «second» place in heaven, is a «king», and is endowed with «wisdom» (148). It is possible

2 Enoch, a Jewish pseudepigraphon with probable Egyptian origins, is preserved only in medieval Slavonic manuscripts, apparently translated from (a) Greek source(s); it is tentatively dated to the first century C.E.[25] There is no

that the parallelism is purely coincidental. Nevertheless, it is more probable that the agreement is due to a common matrix lore.

[25] The following translations of the text are available: F. Andersen, 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 91–221; R. H. Charles, W. R. Morfill, The Book of the Secrets of Enoch (Oxford, 1896); R. H. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrpha of the Old Testament in English. 2 vols. (Oxford, 1913); A. Pennington, 2 Enoch // The Apocryphal Old Testament / Ed. H. F. D. Sparks (Oxford, 1984) 321–362; G. N. Bonwetsch, Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs (Leipzig, 1922) (TU 44); A. Vaillant, Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française (Paris, 1952); A. Kahana, HaSefarim haHitsonim le Torah (Jerusalem, 1936). A Jewish origin of the writing is the majority opinion: Andersen, 2 Enoch… 95–97; Bonwetsch, Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs…; Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrpha…; I. Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism (Leiden, 1980) (AGJU, 14); Kahana, HaSefarim…; H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch* or the Hebrew Book of Enoch (New York, 1973); Enoch, Slavonic Book of // EJ 6. 797–799; M. Philonenko et al. (eds.) Jewish Apocalyptic and its History (Sheffield, 1996) (JSPSS, 20); A. De Santos Otero, Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo) // Apócrifos del *AT IV* / Ed. A. Díez Macho (Madrid, 1984) 147–202; G. Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition (New York, 1965). For a probable Egyptian origin, see Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrpha… Vol. 2. 426; M. Philonenko, La cosmologie du *Livre des secrets d'Hénoch* // Religions en Egypte hellénistique et romaine (Paris, 1969) 109–116; U. Fischer, Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im Hellenistischen Diasporajudentum (Berlin, 1978) (BZNW, 44) 40. For lists of manuscripts, see Andersen, 2 Enoch… 92. Unhelpfully, the argument for a Greek source relies mainly on this text and the historical fact that most medieval Slavonic texts are translations from Greek: A. Rubinstein, Observations on the *Slavonic Book of Enoch* // *JJS* 15 (1962) 1–21; Pennington, 2 Enoch… 324. This is not to say that the Greek is the language of the original. It could very well be itself a translation of a Hebrew or Aramaic text (Andersen, 2 Enoch… 94). Modern scholarship still disputes whether the known versions come from a unique original translation or several sources. A date in the first century C.E. has been proposed by Charles and Morfill, The Book of the Secrets of Enoch…; R. H. Charles, The Date and Place of Writing of the *Slavonic Enoch* // *JTS* 22 (1921) 161–163; Rubinstein, Observations on the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*… 1–21; Pines, Enoch, Slavonic Book of… 797–799; M. Scopello, The Apocalypse of Zostrianos (Nag Hammadi VIII.1) and the Book of the Secrets of Enoch // *VC* 34 (1980) 367–385; De Santos Otero, Libro de los secretos de Henoc… 147–202; Andersen, 2 Enoch… 94–95; idem, The Second Book of Enoch // ABD. 516–522; C. Böttrich, Das slavische Henochbuch (Gütersloh, 1995); J. VanderKam, Enoch: A Man for All Generations (Columbia, 1995); P. Sacchi, Jewish Apocalyptic and its History (Sheffield, 1996) (JSPSup, 20). The *terminus ante quem* could be supplied by the mention of Origen of a book of Enoch about the creation of the world (*De Principiis* 1.3.2). Since *1 Enoch* does not have much material on speculations about creation, it is highly probable that the remark is about *2 Enoch*.

way of telling whether the passage quoted above belongs to the Greek source. The fact that two manuscripts, GIM Khlyudov and RM 508, contain the mistaken rendering of the Greek acronym (ADMA) cannot constitute a proof that the text did not exist in the Greek source of the translation, since the same mistaken rendering occurs in the Greek *Sib. Or.* 3:24–26.[26] It must suffice to say, at the present stage of the research on *2 Enoch*, that the tradition behind the text dates from before 70 C.E., as its occurrence in *Sib. Or.* suggests.

Life of Adam and Eve 57 has the acronym in a correct order (ADAM), but the author confuses the Greek names of south and west. Instead of west-δύσις and south-μεσημβρία, he renders west-*Mencembrion* (sic!) and south-*Disis*. However, the presence of the acronym in this text testifies to the antiquity of the speculations about Adam's name.[27]

> When Adam was made, and there was no name assigned to him yet, the Lord said to the four angels to seek a name for him. Michael went out to the east (*ad orientem*) and saw the eastern star, named Ancolim, and took its first letter from it. Gabriel went out to the south (*ad meridiem*), and saw the southern star, named Disis, and took its first letter from it. Raphael went out to the north (*ad aquilonem*), and saw the northern star, named Arthos, and took its first latter from it. Uriel went out to the west (*ad occidentem*), and saw the western star, named Mencembrion, and took its first letter from it. When the letters were brought together, the Lord said to Uriel: «read these letters». He read them and said, «Adam». The Lord said: «Thus shall his name be called». (*L.A.E.* 57)[28]

One important observation regarding this text and the preceding Enochic text is due here. Although stars generally represent angelic beings in Jewish literature,[29] this does not seem to be the reference in this text.[30]

The tradition about Adam's name deriving from the four directions/stars survives in both East and West Christianity for centuries.[31] For its clear and correct exposition of the acronym, Augustine's *In Evangelium Johannis tractatus* IX:14 deserves a full quotation:

---

[26] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 152 n. m.

[27] *Life of Adam and Eve* is generally dated to the first century CE: M. D. Johnson, Life of Adam and Eve // OTP. Vol. 2. 249–295, here 252.

[28] G. A. Anderson, M. E. Stone (eds.), A Synopsis of the *Books of Adam and* Eve (Atlanta, Georgia, 1999^2), 96E.

[29] J. Fossum, The Image of the Invisible God (Göttingen, 1995) (NTOA, 30) 75.

[30] Thus Charles remarks that «stars may here mean angels», and he refers to examples of texts about angels ministering to Adam (Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 vols. (Oxford, 1913) Vol. 1. 449, n. 14).

[31] For later expressions of this tradition see C. Böttrich, Adam als Mikrokosmos: beine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch (Frankfurt am Main—New York, 1995) 59–72, which follows the tradition up to the eighteenth century.

> 14. Now what I said, brethren, that prophecy extends to all nations (for I wish to show you another meaning in the expression, «Containing two or three metretae apiece»),-that prophecy, I say, extends to all nations, is pointed out, as we have just now reminded you, in Adam, «who is the figure of Him that was to come». Who does not know that from him all nations are sprung; and that in the four letters of his name the four quarters of the globe, by their Greek appellations, are indicated? For if the east, west, north, and south are expressed in Greek even as Holy Scripture mentions them in various places, the initial letters of the words, thou wilt find, make the word Adam: for in Greek the four quarters of the world are called Anatole, Dysis, Arktos, Mesembria. If thou write these four words, one under the other, like four verses, the capital letters form the word Adam. (*Tract. Ev. Jo.* IX:14)[32]

The Body of Adam

The four directions appear in a strikingly similar order in early Rabbinic speculations about Adam's gigantic body.[33] In these traditions Adam is portrayed as having huge dimensions, reaching from east to west and north to south. Expectedly, the Rabbinic traditions do not incorporate the name speculation possible only in Greek, but they do use the same language to portray the first man as enormous in size. A connection between the Hellenistic name speculation and the Rabbinic size speculation is obvious. Given the departure of the first from the very biblical lore about Adam's name (cf. Gen 2:7),[34] the dependence can only be of the first on the latter, and not of the latter on the first. Thus, it seems that the Greek names of the four directions/stars provided for Hellenistic Jewish circles means of elaborating a name speculation on an earlier tradition about Adam's cosmic size.[35]

---

[32] *NPNF*[1] 7:67. For the Latin text I have used M.-F. Berrouard's edition in Œuvres de Saint Augustin (Paris, 1969) (Bibliothèque Augustinienne; 9[e] série) 71:534, 536.

[33] On Adam's enormous body in Judaism see W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology (London, 1948) 45–46; J. Jervell, Imago Dei: *Gen 1:26f* im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen (Göttingen, 1960) 99–100, 105–107; B. Barc, La Taille cosmique d'Adam dans la littérature juive rabbinique des trois premières siècles après J.C. // *RSR* 49 (1975) 173–185; S. Niditch, The Cosmic Man: Man as Mediator in Rabbinic Literature // *JJS* 34 (1983) 137–146; Böttrich, Adam als Mikrokosmos…

[34] For this tradition in Rabbinic Judaism see *Gen. Rab.* 4 and *Pirqe R. El.* 12. Gen 2:7 is also the basis for the tradition in which Adam's body is made out of major elements of the earth. For texts see Böttrich, Adam als Mikrokosmos… 35–53, 73–82; Barc, La Taille cosmique d'Adam…; Niditch, The Cosmic Man… For the Latin speculation *homo-humus* see E. Turdeanu, Dieu créa l'homme de huit éléments et tira son nom des quatre coins du monde // *Revue des Études Roumaines* 13–14 (1974) 163–194, here p. 167.

[35] Thus against Barc, who concludes that the Rabbinic traditions are not earlier than the third century C.E. (La Taille cosmique d'Adam… 183–185).

The Babylonian Talmudic tractates *b. Sanh.* 38b and *b. Ḥag.* 12a preserve one of these Rabbinic traditions, attributed to Rab and to R. Eleazar (the latter also in *b. Sanh.* 23b).

> Rab Judah said in Rab's name: The first man reached from one end of the world to the other, as it is written, «Since the day that God created man upon the earth, even from the one end of the Heaven unto the other» (Deut 4: 32). But when he sinned, the Holy One, blessed be He, laid His hand upon him and diminished him, as it is written, «Thou hast hemmed me in behind and before, and laid Thy hands upon me» (Ps 139: 5).
> R. Eleazar said: The first man reached from earth to heaven, as it is written, «Since the day that God created man upon the earth, and from one end of the Heaven to the other» (Deut 4: 32). But when he sinned, the Holy One, blessed be He, laid his hand upon him and diminished him, for it is written, «Thou hast hemmed me in behind and before, and laid Thy hands upon me» (Ps 139: 5). (*b. Sanh.* 38b)[36]

Genesis Rabbah 8:1, 21:3, and 24:2 also attributes the teaching to R. Eleazar. The testimony is attributed to two of his disciples, R. Joshua b. Nehemiah and R. Judah b. Simon.

> R. Joshua b. R. Nehemiah and R. Judah b. R. Simon in R. Eleazar's name said: He created him filling the whole world. How do we know that he stretched from east to west? Because it is said, «Thou hast formed me behind and before» (Ps 139:5). From north to south? Because it says «Since the day that God created man upon the earth, and from the one end of Heaven unto the other» (Deut 4:32). And how do we know that he filled the empty space of the world? From the verse «And laid Thy hand upon me» (Job 13:21). (*Gen. Rab.* 8:1)[37]

A very similar teaching is ascribed to third generation Palestinian amoraim without (apparently) any debt to Rab or his disciples. *Leviticus Rabbah* 14:1 describes this tradition:

> R. Berekiah and Rabbi Helbo and Rabbi Samuel b. Nahman said: When the Holy One, blessed be He, created the first man, He created him from one end of the universe to the other (in size).
> Whence do we know that Adam was in size from east to west? Since it is said: «Thou hast formed me west and east» (Ps 139:5).
> Whence do we know that he was in size from north to south? Since it is said: «God created man upon earth, even from one end of the heaven unto the other» (Deut 4:32).

[36] This and all subsequent translations from the Talmud follow the English translation in: The Babylonian Talmud (London, 1935).

[37] This and all subsequent translations follow the English translation in: Midrash Rabbah. 10 vols. (London, 1939).

> And whence do we derive that he was in height as the whole space of the universe? Since it is said: «And Thou hast laid Thy arch upon me». (*Lev. Rab.* 14:1)[38]

Leviticus Rabbah 18:2 attributes a very similar teaching to R. Joshua ben Levi, a first generation Palestinian amora, contemporary with Rab (~220 C.E.).

> R. Judah b. R. Simon said in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi: When the Holy One, blessed be He, created Adam, the first man, He created him of a size to fill all the world, from east to west, as it is said: «Thou hast formed me west and east» (Ps 139:5); from the north to the south, as it is said: «God created man upon earth, from the one end of heaven unto the other» (Deut 4:32).
> Whence do we know that he created man as tall as the whole space of the universe? Scripture tells us this by saying: «And Thou hast laid Thy palm upon me» (Ps 139:5). (*Lev. Rab.* 18:2)[39]

All these testimonies present only few differences between them. The most striking connection between the two forms attributed to Rab and respectively to R. Joshua is the common use of Psalm 139. One can only read behind this common use the early Jewish tradition that the psalm is an autobiographical creation of Adam himself.[40] In both traditions the psalm is used to provide the link between Adam's size and the four directions. In both אחור (behind) and קדם (before) are read as west and east. Most probably, the two forms of the tradition seem to stem from a common source, an even earlier tradition about Adam's enormous size.

This early tradition might be alluded to in the classical Palestinian midrash *Pirqe de Rabbi Kahanah*. The midrash attributes to R. Meir the following succinct statement: «At that moment the first man's stature (קומה) was cut down and diminished to one hundred cubits». Given the fact that one hundred cubits is itself a huge dimension for a diminished man, one can only imagine that Adam's size before «diminishment» was enormous. The tradition is already hinted at in Philo (*On the Creation of Man*, 148), who describes the first human as *mikrokosmos*, created from four elements of the earth. In an immediately preceding passage Adam is described as «most excellent in each part of his being, in both soul and body, and greatly excelling those who came after him in the transcendent qualities of both».[41] Expectedly, Philo emphasizes in the next passage that the extraordinary quality of Adam's body consists of beauty and goodness.

---

[38] Midrash Rabbah... Vol. 4. 177–178.

[39] Ibid. 227–228.

[40] *b. B. Bat.* 14b; Barc, La Taille cosmique d'Adam... 175.

[41] *On the Creation of Man*, 148, in *Philo* (11 vols. (Cambridge, MA, 1949–1956) (LCL) Vol. 1. 109).

The tradition is attested in the second century C.E., Christian apocryphal *Gospel of Bartholomew* 21–23.

> [21] Bartholomew said to him: ... Tell me, Lord, who was he whom the angels carried in their arms, that exceedingly large man?... [22] It was Adam, the first created, for whose sake I came down from heaven upon the earth... [23] Again Bartholomew said: Lord, I also saw the angels ascending before Adam and singing praises... (*Gos. Bart.* 21–23)[42]

Apocalypse of Abraham 23:4–6 is evidence of the same lore about Adam's enormous size at the end of the first century C.E.[43]

> My eyes ran to the side of the garden of Eden. And I saw there a man very great in height and terrible in breadth, incomparable in aspect, entwined with a woman who was also equal to the man in aspect and size. And they were standing under a tree of Eden. (*Apoc. Ab.* 23:4–6)[44]

Adam's Body in the Image of God

The form of this lore attested in *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer* 11[45] preserves a significant connection between Adam's cosmic proportions and his condition as bearer of the image of God.[46] The resemblance between Adam and God is so close that the angels mistake Adam for God. The aspect that the text identifies as the source of the angelic confusion is Adam's appearance, more specifically his height. The text mentions two of the four directions on the basis of Ps 139:5:

---

[42] E. Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha. 2 vols. / Ed. W. Schneemelcher; trans. R. M. Wilson (Philadelphia, 1963) Vol. 1. 490–491.

[43] For the dating of the apocalypse, see L. Ginzberg, Abraham, Apocalypse of // Jewish Encyclopedia. Vol. 1 (1904) 91–92; R. Rubinkiewicz, L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en slave (Lublin, 1987) (Société des Lettres et des Sciences de l'Université Catholique de Lublin; Zródla i monografie, 129); Idem, Apocalypse of Abraham // OTP. Vol. 1: 681–705, here 683.

[44] Rubinkiewicz, Apocalypse of Abraham... 1:700.

[45] The writing dates from the 8th or 9th century C.E., but it is generally accepted that it contains traditions going back as far as the first century C.E.

[46] Morton Smith has noted that the Rabbinic concept of צלם has anthropomorphic connotations and that one of its meanings is that the human body is itself made in the image of God: The Image of God: Notes on the Hellenization of Judaism with Special Reference to Goodenough's Work on Jewish Symbols // *BJRL* 40 (1958) 473–512; On the Shape of God and the Humanity of the Gentiles // Religions in Antiquity / Ed. J. Neusner (Leiden, 1970) 315–326. More recently A. G. Gottstein has convincingly demonstrated that the only Rabbinic reading of צלם is anthropomorphic (The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature // *HTR* 87 (1994) 171–195). All other meanings seem to be developments of this original reading. However, Gottstein does not force his thesis as far as to identify the image with the physical body, with Adam's corporeality. His argument focuses on the concept of body of light, a broader and more inclusive term.

> Adam stood and began to gaze upwards and downwards... He stood on his feet and was adorned with the Divine Image. His height was from east to west, as it is said, «Thou hast beset me behind and before» (Ps 139:5). «Behind» refers to the west, and «before» refers to the east. All the creatures saw him and became afraid of him, thinking that he was their creator, and they came to prostrate themselves before him. (*Pirqe R. El.* 11)[47]

The lore about the angelic confusion can be traced further back in time. *Genesis Rabbah* 8:10 describes the angels' impetus to sing Adam the *Sanctus* due to God. The text identifies the source of the confusion by means of a comparison. Adam and God are compared with a governor and his king that both sit in the same chariot in royal glory. Their subjects are unable to distinguish the king from the governor because of their resemblance. The king has to identify himself and pushes the governor out of the chariot in order to prevent his subjects from offering his governor the honor due to him alone. God's own way of distinguishing himself from Adam is by bringing sleep upon him.[48] It is interesting that the text chooses as comparison for God and Adam two royal charioteers, of whom one is a king, the other is his viceregent. What puzzles the angels is the resemblance between the two «charioteers», more specifically between their appearances. Their appearances are so much alike that they cannot be distinguished from one another. A. G. Gottstein offers a similar reading of the passage, and his insights are valuable (although he does not remark on the *merkabah* connotations of the comparison). He notes that in *Genesis Rabbah* 8:10,

> the image is not a replica of the original... (The Angels') mistake is based on the identification of the form of the source with that of the image... Adam is distinguished from God not by form, but by the different quality of life attached to the same form; in other words, God and Adam are distinguished not by body, but by bodily function.[49]

The connection between Adam's enormous size and his resemblance to God is also attested in the above-mentioned *Gospel of Bartholomew* 52–53. After the text portrays Adam as enormous in size, it develops on the same lore of the angelic worship of Adam and connects the worship with Adam's identity as the Image of God:

> 52 But the devil said: Allow me to tell you how I was cast down here, and how God made man. 53 I wandered to and fro in the world, and God said to Michael: Bring me earth from the four ends of the world and water out

[47] Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer / Ed. G. Friedlander (New York, 1965) 79.

[48] In the later *Otiyot de-Rabbi Akiva* God's «solution» to the confusion is to diminish Adam. This is, although late, an important evidence that bodily enormity is part of the resemblance between God and Adam.

[49] The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature... 182.

> of the four rivers of paradise. And when Michael had brought them to him, he formed Adam in the east, and gave form to the shapeless earth, and stretched sinews and veins, and united everything into a harmonious whole. And he worshipped [translation corrected] him for his own sake, because he was his image. (*Gos. Bart.* 52–53)[50]

In the second century C.E. Irenaeus reports that Sethians and Ophites maintain a tradition according to which the first man is of an enormous size. The passage follows a citation of Gen 1:26 and suggests a connection with the concept of image of God.

> They affirm that Ialdabaoth exclaimed, «Come, let us make man after our image». The six powers, on hearing this, and their mother furnishing them with the idea of a man (in order that by means of him she might empty them of their original power), jointly formed a man of immense size, both in regard to breadth and length. (*Haer.* I.30.6)[51]

---

[50] Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha… Vol. 1. 500.

[51] ANF. Vol. 1. 355. «Breadth» and «length» seem to denote the extent of the enormous body between the four directions. Instead of marking the extremes, they point to the intervals or distances between them. In another chapter of the same writing Irenaeus addresses measurers of God's body with the following words: «To these persons one may with justice say, as Scripture itself suggests: To what distance above God do you lift up your imaginations, O you rashly elated men? You have heard that "the heavens are meted out in the palm of [His] hand". Tell me the measure, and recount the endless multitude of cubits, explain to me the fullness, the breadth, the length, the height, the beginning and end of the measurement — things which the heart of man understands not, neither does it comprehend them. For the heavenly treasuries are indeed great: God cannot be measured in the heart, and incomprehensible is He in the mind; He who holds the earth in the hollow of His hand» (*Haer.* IV.19.2; ANF. Vol. 1. 487). Interestingly, «breath» (πλάτος), «length» (μῆκος), and «height» (ὕψος) appear to be technical terms among the anthropomorphites that Irenaeus refutes.

It is also interesting to note that the same three words plus «depth» (βάθος) appear in a very similar imagery in the Pauline corpus, namely in Eph 3:18. N. A. Dahl makes a strong argument that the four words refer to the dimensions of the universe (Cosmic Dimensions and Religious Knowledge (Eph 3: 18) // Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift für W. G. Kümmel (Göttingen, 1975) 57–75). A. G. Gottstein also argues that Eph 3: 18 is an anthropomorphic reference to the body of the כבוד מה למעלה למה מטה מה לפנים למה לאחור // Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies, August 16–24 1989 (Jerusalem, 1990) C:61–68).

A passage of the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* provides a connection between the cosmic and the anthropomorphic significance of the terms. In homily 17:9, after an extensive discussion of God's corporeality, the enormous divine body is portrayed as containing six «infinities», which are identified as 1. «height» (ὕψος) or the «above» (ἄνω); 2. «depth» (βάθος) or the «below» (κάτω); 3. «right hand»; 4. «left hand»; 5. «before» (ἔμπροσθεν); 6. and «behind» (ὄπισθεν) (*Ps.-Clem.* 17:9; ANF. Vol. 8.

Testament of Abraham, a Jewish pseudepigraphon, is preserved in two recensions: long and short.[52] The long recension is supported by Greek and Romanian manuscripts only.[53] The shorter recension has versions in Greek, Romanian, Slavonic, Coptic, Arabic, and Ethiopic.[54] The literary history of

320). The text is also of major significance because it provides the connection between the language of breath-length-height-depth and the equally important language of above-below-before-behind. The latter is attested for the first time in Ezekiel the Tragedian's *Exagoge* lines 78, 88–89 in a description of the cosmic proportions of Moses' knowledge (R. G. Robertson, Ezekiel the Tragedian // OTP. Vol. 2. 803–819, here p. 812). *b. Ḥag.* 12a ascribes a similar extent to the esoteric initiate's knowledge. A similarly extensive knowledge is attributed to Metatron in *3 En.* 10:5 (P. S. Alexander, 3 Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 223–315, here p. 264). Thus there is a connection between the cosmic dimensions of the body (of God) and the cosmic extent of this special knowledge. In what regards human «copies» of the divine body, this implies that a cosmic knowledge requires cosmic enlargement and dimensions. The principle seems to be that one cannot know what one does not reach. Indeed this is the case with Moses in Ezekiel the Tragedian and with Enoch-Metatron in *3 Enoch*. Both heroes are enlarged first and then they become omniscient, it seems as a consequence of the enlargement. The pseudo-Clementine passage links the two concepts, and, more clearly, in *bHag* 12a the cosmic knowledge is inferred from the cosmic dimensions of Adam (text above) and from the omnipresence of the first-created light.

[52] For translations, see G. H. Box, The Testament of Abraham: Translated from the Greek Text with Introduction and Notes (London, 1927); M. Delcor, Le Testament d'Abraham (Leiden, 1973) (SVTP, 2); M. Stone, Testament of Abraham. The Greek Recensions (Missoula, 1972) (SBLPS, 2); E. P. Sanders, Testament of Abraham // OTP. Vol. 1. 871–902; F. Schmidt, Le Testament grec d'Abraham (Tübingen, 1986); N. Turner, The Testament of Abraham // The Apocryphal Old Testament / Ed. H. D. Sparks (Oxford, 1984) 393–421. For an analysis of the debates regarding the Jewishness of the text, see especially D. C. Allison, Jr, Testament of Abraham (Berlin—New York, 2003) (CEJL) 28–31. On the testament in general, see M. James, The Testament of Abraham: The Greek Text Now First Edited with an Introduction and Notes (Cambridge, 1892); Box, The Testament of Abraham…; Delcor, Le Testament d'Abraham…; G. Nickelsburg (ed.), Studies in the Testament of Abraham (Missoula, 1976) (SBLSCS, 6); Allison, Testament of Abraham…

[53] The Greek manuscripts of the longer recension are critically published and edited in Schmidt, Le Testament grec d'Abraham… 96–169; Stone, Testament of Abraham… 2–57. For a list of the manuscripts see Schmidt, Testament grec d'Abraham… 2–3, 17–26; Allison, Testament of Abraham… 4–6. The Romanian manuscripts are listed in N. Roddy, The Romanian Version of the Testament of Abraham. Text, Translation, and Cultural Context (Atlanta, GA, 2001) (Early Jewish Literature Series) 9–12; É. Turdeanu, Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament (Leiden, 1981) 234–235; Schmidt, Le Testament grec d'Abraham… 37–38; N. Cartojan, Cărţile populare în literatura românrscă. 2 vols. (Bucureşti, 1929) Vol. 1. 114–115.

[54] The Greek versions are critically edited in Schmidt, Testament grec d'Abraham… 46–95; Stone, Testament of Abraham… 58–87. For a list of these versions see Schmidt, Testament grec d'Abraham… 1–2, 6–10; Allison, Testament of Abraham… 6–7. For

the *Testament* (i.e., the antiquity and interconnection of the two recensions) and, implicitly, the dating of the extant versions are still very much subjects of debate. However, there is a growing consensus that places the date of the original no later than the first century C.E.[55] M. James, G. Box, M. Delcor, G. Nickelsburg, E. P. Sanders, and D. C. Allison have argued that the longer recension has chronological priority and that it preserves more accurately the original work, which is supposedly a common root of both recensions.[56] Several other scholars contend that the shorter recension has priority.[57] It must be emphasized that even this latter position does not warrant a dismissal of the theological importance of the longer recension, or of the possible testimonies, however late, for ancient traditions recorded therein. Chapter 11 of the longer recension contains a portrayal of Adam that associates the protoplast with the *kābôd*. During Abraham's tour of heaven with Michael, the patriarch sees a mysterious enthroned figure. This figure recalls the description of

lists of the Romanian manuscripts see Schmidt, Testament grec d'Abraham… 36–37; Turdeanu, Apocryphes slaves et roumains… The Slavonic manuscripts are listed in Schmidt, Testament grec d'Abraham… 33–36; Turdeanu, Apocryphes slaves et roumains… 201–238. The only Coptic version published and translated is the manuscript *Vaticanus Copt.* 61, fols. 148v–163v: I. Guidi, Il testo copto del Testamento di Abrahamo // Rendiconti della reale academia dei Lincei, classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche serie Quinta. Vol. IX (Rome, 1900) 157–180; G. MacRae, The Coptic Testament of Abraham // Nickelsburg, Studies in the Testament of Abraham… 327–340; M. Chaîne, Traduction des Testaments faite sur le texte copte bohaïrique // Delcor, Le Testament d'Abraham… 186–213; E. Andersson, Abraham's Vermächtnis aus dem Koptischen übersetzt // *Sphinx* 6 (1903) 220–236. The other known Coptic version, a fifth-century papyrus at the Institut für Altertumskunde of the University of Cologne, remains, to the best of my knowledge, unpublished, although publication was promised many decades ago: M. Philonenko, Le Testament de Job (Paris, 1968) (Semitica, 18) 61. For descriptions of the Arabic manuscripts, see Schmidt, Le Testament grec d'Abraham… 42–43; Allison, Testament of Abraham… 8–9. For the Ethiopic manuscripts, see Schmidt, Le Testament grec d'Abraham… 43–44; Allison, Testament of Abraham… 9.

[55] For dating, see Sanders, Testament of Abraham… 874–876; Allison, Testament of Abraham… 34–40; P. Munoa, Four Powers in Heaven. The Interpretation of *Daniel* 7 in the Testament of Abraham (Sheffield, 1998) 17–18; Delcor, Le Testament d'Abraham… 47–51, 73–77.

[56] James, The Testament of Abraham… 49; Box, The Testament of Abraham… XIII; Delcor, Le Testament d'Abraham… 33; Nickelsburg, Studies in the Testament of Abraham… 47–64; Sanders, Testament of Abraham… 872–873; Allison, Testament of Abraham… 12–27. James argues that the priority does not extend to the vocabulary; the vocabulary of the short recension is a more accurate witness of the original work. The followers of his position generally accept this conclusion. Allison makes a strong case for later Christian interpolations in the long recension.

[57] Thus Turdeanu, Schmidt, Turner, etc.

the *kabod* in Ezekiel 1 and suggests that some mystical circles identified the primordial man with the divine *kabod* at least as early as first century C.E. The text describes the «appearance» (ἰδέα) of the enthroned Adam-*kabod* as «like that of the Master's».[58] The text clearly implies that God has a human-like «appearance» (ἰδέα). But it also depicts a similarity between God's corporeality and Adam's. Given the fact that, based on such biblical text as Isa 66:1, the humanlike form of God is commonly portrayed as huge in early Jewish anthropomorphic speculations,[59] Adam's resemblance with God entails an enormous size.

Toward the end of the fourth century C.E. Gregory of Nyssa warns his audience in a sermon (i.e. *Homilies on the Origin of Man*) about a widespread and well-known anthropomorphic reading of Gen 1:26. He locates it among the Jews, but the warning itself implies that the exegesis is also popular within his Christian audience. He warns his audience not to imagine God as a form (μορφή) in Jewish manner (ἰουδαικῶς), and emphasizes that the image (εἴκων) of God (Gen 1:26) is not the form of the body (μορφὴ σώματος).[60] The problematic tradition clearly associates God's image with the form of His body.

The «image» (εἴκων) of God is identified as «form» (μορφή) in *Sibylline Oracles* 3:8, and in 3:27 the image is «the shape of the form of men» (τύπος μορφῆς).[61] Interestingly, the first passage precedes closely the text mentioned above about Adam's enormous size, stretching between the four directions (i.e. *Sibylline Oracles* 3:24–26), while the second follows immediately after it, suggesting a connection between the form, the size, and the name of the first man.

According to *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*, a Jewish-Christian writing from the beginning of the third century C.E.,[62] God has a corporeal form, after which the first man is modeled (10:6, 16:19, 17:7).[63] In 3:7 man's body (σῶμα) bears the form (μορφή) of God.[64] In 11:4, which contains a word by word repetition of the passage from 3:7, the form of God is replaced and thus identified with the image (εἴκων) of God.[65]

---

[58] Sanders, Testament of Abraham… 888.

[59] Origen testifies to this lore in his *Homilies on Genesis* 1:13. According to him some Jews and Christians conceive God is corporeal terms, imagining him composed of members and body like a human. Origen gives the valuable information that such teachings are exegetically based on texts like Isa 66:1.

[60] H. Hörner, Gregorii Nysseni Opera. Supplementum (Leiden, 1972) 9–10.

[61] Collins, Sibylline Oracles… 362.

[62] Thus J. Quasten, Patrology. 3 vols. (Westminster, MD, 1990) Vol. 1. 62.

[63] ANF. Vol. 8. 281, 316, and 319–320.

[64] Ibid. 240.

[65] Ibid. 285.

C. Fletcher-Louis[66] notes that one manuscript variant of *Life of Adam and Eve* 27:3 calls Adam the «form» (*figura*) of God's «body» (*corpus*):

> *Et ecce verbum tuum incedit mihi et dixit dominus ad me: quoniam figura corporis mei factus es diligens scientiam, propter hoc non tolletur de semine tuo usque in seculum ad ministrandum mihi.*[67]

Moreover, Adam is described not as created in the image of God, a mere copy of the divine corporeality, but as the image itself, the very corporeal צלם אלהים. *Life of Adam and Eve* 14–16 narrates the story of the fall of Satan in a form similar to the *Gospel of Bartholomew* 52–53, similarity that proves that the story constitutes a wide-spread lore by the end of the second century C.E. Michael summons the angels to worship Adam and calls him «the image (*imago*) of the Lord God» (14.2).[68] Similarly in *Apocalypse of Moses* 33 and 35 the angels pray for God's forgiveness for the fallen Adam, reminding Him that the first man is His image (εἰκών σου ἐστιν).[69]

In conclusion, the reference to the four directions in *Testament of Moses* 11:8 occurs in the theological context of the first century C.E. in which they are frequently used in descriptions of Adam's enormous corporeality. Moreover, the protoplast's corporeality is associated with Adam's quality of bearer of the image of God. Within this context *Testament of Moses* 11:8 seems to claim a similar corporeality and quality of image of God for Moses. That this is the case becomes evident through an analysis of the connections between Moses and Adam in the thought of late Second Temple period.

The Intertext

Moses as Adam's Heir

Both Samaritan and Jewish texts provide evidence that Second Temple circles perceived a direct link between the two biblical figures, Moses and Adam. An early common lore considered Moses the heir of Adam's corporeality, of his צלם אלהים.

Thus *Memar Marqa* 5:4 tells that Moses «was vested with the form (or image: צלמה) which Adam cast off in the Garden of Eden».[70] Moses is clearly portrayed as the inheritor of Adam's lost image.[71] The Samaritan writ-

[66] Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology (Tübingen, 1997) 143, n.195.

[67] W. Meyer, Vita Adae et Evae // *Abhandlungen der königlichen Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philsoph.-philologische Klasse* 14.3 (1878) 185–250.

[68] M. D. Johnson, Life of Adam and Eve // OTP. Vol. 2. 250–295, here p. 262.

[69] Ibid. 289.

[70] Memar Marqah. 2 vols. / Ed. and trans. J. Macdonald (Berlin, 1963) Vol. 2. 209.

[71] Recently A. G. Gottstein has demonstrated that the basis for comparison between Moses and Adam is the image of God (The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature… 182).

ing also identifies the image/likeness of God as a form. While 2:1 reads «Glorious is the form (הצורה) in the likeness (דמות) of Elohim»,[72] Fossum remarks that the passage has a close parallel in 4:2. In this parallel text, he observes, the image of God or «the form of the likeness of God» of 2:1 is identified as Adam's form.[73] The text reads: «The form (צורתה) of Adam is glorified all over».[74] Afterwards the form of Adam is identified with the glory (איקרה) with which God vested Moses. Moreover, in 2:10 the form (צורתה) of Adam is called his body (גויתה) and a creation out of dust.[75] Moses is therefore the inheritor of Adam's lost corporeality.

The same connection between Adam and Moses is stated in *Deuteronomy Rabbah* 11:3. The text describes an argument between the two biblical heroes over supremacy. Moses claims it on account of his inheritance of what Adam lost in Eden, which is Adam's original resemblance to God.

Moses' Enormous Body

The connection with Adam's original state develops into speculations about Moses' enormous corporeality. Traditions about Moses' huge body are attested as early as the second century B.C.E. Ezekiel the Tragedian, a play writer from the end of the second century B.C.E., describes in his play *Exagoge* a transformation that Moses experiences on Sinai (vv. 68–89).[76] Moses has a vision of a huge throne (reminiscent of Isa 66:1) on which a humanlike figure is seated. The unnamed figure beckons Moses with his right hand. When Moses approaches, he is enthroned on the enormous throne and endowed with heavenly royalty. Three remarks are due about this important passage.

First, Moses' enthronement implies an enlargement to the huge dimensions of the throne. Second, both Talmudic traditions mentioned above about Adam's enormous body (i.e. the one belonging to Rab and the one belonging to R. Joshua b. Levi) connect Adam's exceptional size with the laying of God's hand upon him on basis of Job 13:21 and Ps 139:5. An imagery strikingly similar appears in *2 Enoch* 39 (shorter recension).[77] The text describes Enoch in a vision-transformation situation, similar to Moses' in Ezekiel's play. In the vision God beckons Enoch with his right hand (39:5) and Enoch sees the extent of God (39:6).[78] Third, according to later Jewish and Samar-

[72] Memar Marqah… Vol. 2. 47.

[73] J. Fossum, The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Mediation Concepts and the Origin of Gnosticism (Tübingen, 1985) (WUNT, 36) 93.

[74] Memar Marqah… Vol. 2. 140.

[75] Ibid.73.

[76] Robertson, Ezekiel the Tragedian… 803–819, here p. 812.

[77] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 91–221, here p. 163.

[78] As noted above, Irenaeus addresses an anthropomorphite sect in *Haer.* IV.19.2 (ANF. Vol. 1. 487). A focus on God's right hand seems to occupy a very important

itan texts it is on Sinai that Moses is endowed with Adam's lost image, or with Adam's original corporeality/form.[79]

Conclusions

In a very important article that analyzes the development of early traditions about a hypostatic body of God in Judaism, Christianity and Gnosticism, G. Stroumsa concludes:

> The various traditions about God's hypostatic form seem to converge upon the Judaism of the first Christian century. The cumulative evidence leads to the tentative conclusion that there existed then a cluster of mythologoumena about the archangelic hypostasis of God, also identified with the First Adam (and therefore the true image of God), whose body possessed cosmic proportions.[80]

Following the evidence presented in this article, it can be safely assumed that the text of *Testament of Moses* 11:8 refers to Moses' enormous stature in

---

place in the teachings of this sect. The teachings did not only include speculations about the measurements of the divine hand, but also speculations about its measuring/enlarging functions: «To these persons one may with justice say, as Scripture itself suggests: To what distance above God do you lift up your imaginations, O you rashly elated men? You have heard that "the heavens are meted out in the palm of [His] hand". Tell me the measure, and recount the endless multitude of cubits, explain to me the fullness, the breadth, the length, the height, the beginning and end of the measurement — things which the heart of man understands not, neither does it comprehend them. For the heavenly treasuries are indeed great: God cannot be measured in the heart, and incomprehensible is He in the mind; He who holds the earth in the hollow of His hand. Who perceives the measure of His right hand? Who knows His finger? Or who does understand His hand — that hand which measures immensity; that hand which, by its own measure, spreads out the measure of the heavens, and which comprises in its hollow the earth with the abysses; which contains in itself the breadth, and length, and the deep below, and the height above of the whole creation; which is seen, which is heard and understood, and which is invisible? And for this reason God is "above all principality, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named", of all things which have been created and established. He it is who fills the heavens, and views the abysses, who is also present with every one of us. For he says, "Am I a God at hand, and not a God afar off? If any man is hid in secret places, shall I not see him?" For His hand lays hold of all things, and that it is which illumines the heavens, and lightens also the things which are under the heavens, and tries the reins and the hearts, is also present in hidden things, and in our secret [thoughts], and does openly nourish and preserve us».

[79] *Deuteronomy Rabbah* 11:3, *Memar Marqa* 5:4, 6:3. For more texts, see also W. A. Meeks, Moses as God and King // Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough / Ed. J. Neusner (Leiden, 1968) 334–371.

[80] Stroumsa, Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ… 279.

the context/intertext of first century speculations about Adam's enormous body. The portrayal of Moses in our text follows not only the imagery of these speculations, but it also employs their language, specifically the mention of the four directions and the use of *aetas* (as stature). Within this context Moses is portrayed as enormous in words of evident anthropomorphic connotations.

ABSTRACT

As part of an incessantly growing literature on Moses, the portrayal of Moses in Testament of Moses has received extensive attention in modern scholarship. While the peculiarity of 11:8, in which Moses' sepulcher is described as covering the whole world, from one extremity to another, has been long noted, the paragraph has not yet been analyzed in any thorough study. This article analyzes 11:8 in its textual and contextual aspects. It argues that the peculiar words about Moses' burial constitute an expression of a Second Temple tradition that portrays Moses as a physically enormous being. *Aetas*, which is a translation for the Greek ἡλικία, meaning both stature and age, is part of the language of speculations about God's enormous corporeality as early as the first century C.E. Augustine's polemics attest that the term is still part of the language of Christian anthropomorphite circles in the fifth century. The four directions in 11:8 appear in similar contemporary (first century C.E.) speculations about Adam's enormous size. The connection, often competitive, between Adam and Moses is attested in an early Jewish lore that considers Moses the heir of Adam's corporeality, of his צלם אלהים. This lore provides the theological context in which expressions used in descriptions of Adam's enormous corporeality become elements of the portrayal of Moses' body.

Andrei A. Orlov
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

CELESTIAL CHOIRMASTER: THE LITURGICAL ROLE OF ENOCH-METATRON IN *2 ENOCH* AND THE MERKABAH TRADITION

Introduction

In one of his recent publications, Philip Alexander traces the development of Enoch's image through the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period up to the early Middle Ages.[1] His study points to «a genuine, ongoing tradition» that shows the astonishing persistence of certain motifs. As an example, Alexander explicates the evolution of Enoch's priestly role which was prominent in the Second Temple materials and underwent in the later Merkabah sources further development in Metatron's sacerdotal duties. He observes that «Enoch in *Jubilees* in the second century BCE is a high priest. Almost a thousand years later he retains this role in the Heikhalot texts, though in a rather different setting».[2] Noting the long-lasting association of Enoch-Metatron[3] with the sacerdotal office, Alexander draws attention to the priestly

[1] P. S. Alexander, From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch // M. E. Stone, T. A. Bergen (eds.), Biblical Figures Outside the Bible (Harrisburg, 1998) 87–122 (102–104); H. Odeberg, 3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch (New York, 1973) 52–63.

[2] Alexander, From Son of Adam to a Second God… 107.

[3] On Metatron see, among others, D. Abrams, The Boundaries of Divine Ontology: The Inclusion and Exclusion of Metatron in the Godhead // *HTR* 87 (1994) 291–321; P. S. Alexander, The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch // *JJS* 28–29 (1977–1978) 156–180; idem, 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 223–315; H. Bietenhard, Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum (Tübingen, 1951) (WUNT, 2) 143–160; M. Black, The Origin of the Name Metatron // *VT* 1 (1951) 217–219; M. S. Cohen, The Shiʿur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism (Lanham, MD, 1983) 124–132; J. Dan, The Seven-ty Names of Metatron // idem, Jewish Mysticism: Late Antiquity. 2 vols. (Northvale, 1998) Vol. 1. 229–234; J. Dan, The Ancient Jewish Mysticism (Tel-Aviv, 1993) 108–124; J. R. Davila, Of Methodology, Monotheism and Metatron // The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus / Ed. C. C. Newman, J. R. Davila, G. S. Lewis (Leiden, 1999) (SJSJ, 63) 3–18; J. R. Davila, Melchizedek, the «Youth», and Jesus // idem (ed.), The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001 (Leiden, 2003) (STDJ, 46) 248–274; W. Fauth, Tatrosjah-totrosjah und Meta-

role of this exalted figure attested in *3 Enoch* 15B where Enoch-Metatron is put in charge of the heavenly tabernacle. The passage from *Sefer Hekhalot* reads:

---

tron in der jüdischen Merkabah-Mystik // *JSJ* 22 (1991) 40–87; C. Fletcher-Louis, Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology (Tübingen, 1997) (WUNT, 2/94) 156; D. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot* (Tübingen, 1988) 420–427; M. Hengel, Studies in Early Christology (Edinburgh, 1995) 191–194; I. Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism (Leiden, 1980) (AGAJU, 17) 195–206; M. Himmelfarb, A Report on Enoch in Rabbinic Literature // *SBLSP* (1978) 259–269; C. Kaplan, The Angel of Peace, Uriel — Metatron // *Anglican Theological Review* 13 (1931) 306–313; M. Idel, Enoch is Metatron // *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–240; idem, The Mystical Experience of Abraham Abulafia / Trans. J. Chipman (Albany, NY, 1988) 117–119; idem, Metatron — Comments on the Development of Jewish Myth // Myth in Jewish Thought / Ed. H. Pedayah (Beer Sheva, 1996) 29–44; S. Lieberman, שקיעין (Jerusalem, 1939) 11–16; idem, Metatron, the Meaning of his Name and his Functions // Appendix to Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism… 235–241; M. Mach, Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit (Tübingen, 1992) (TSAJ, 34) 394–396; R. Margaliot, מלאכי עליון (Jerusalem, 1964) 73–108; J. Milik, The Books of Enoch (Oxford, 1976) 125–135; G. F. Moore, Intermediaries in Jewish Theology: Memra, Shekinah, Metatron // *HTR* 15 (1922) 41–85; C. Mopsik, Le Livre hébreu d'Hénoch ou Livre des palais (Paris, 1989) 44–48; C. R. A. Morray-Jones, Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition // *JJS* 43 (1992) 1–31 (7–11); A. Murtonen, The Figure of Metatron // *VT* 3 (1953) 409–411; H. Odeberg, Föreställningarna om Metatron i äldre judisk mystic // *Kyrkohistorisk Årsskrift* 27 (1927) 1–20; idem, 3 Enoch, or the Book of Enoch… 79–146; idem, Enoch // TDNT. Vol. 2. 556–560; A. Orlov, Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch* // *JSP* 18 (1998) 71–86; idem, The Origin of the Name «Metatron» and the Text of 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse), of Enoch // *JSP* 21 (2000) 19–26; P. Schäfer, Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism (Albany, NY, 1992) 29–32; G. Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (Jerusalem, 1941) 43–55; idem, Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition (New York, 1960) 43–55; idem, Metatron // EJ 11. 1443–1446; idem, Kabbalah (New York, 1987) 377–381; idem, Origins of the Kabbalah (Princeton, 1990) 214–215; A. F. Segal, Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism (Leiden, 1977) (SJLA, 25) 60–73; G. G. Stroumsa, Form(s), of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ // *HTR* 76 (1983) 269–288; L. T. Stuckenbruck, Angel Veneration and Christology (Tübingen, 1995) (WUNT, 2.70) 71–73; I. Tishby, The Wisdom of the Zohar. 3 vols (London, 1989) Vol. 2. 626–632; G. Vajda, Pour le Dossier de Metatron // Studies in Jewish Religious and Intellectual History Presented to A. Altmann / Ed. S. Stein, R. Loewe (Alabama, 1979) 345–354; E. E. Urbach, The Sages, Their Concepts and Beliefs / Trans. I. Abrahams. 2 vols. (Jerusalem, 1975) Vol. 1. 138–139; Vol. 2. 743–744; E. Wolfson, Through a Speculum that Shines: Vision and Imagination in Medieval Jewish Mysticism (Princeton, NJ, 1994) 113, 334; idem, Metatron and Shi^{c}ur Qomah in the Writings of Haside Ashkenaz // Mysticism, Magic and Kabbalah in Ashkenazi Judaism / Ed. K. E. Groezinger, J. Dan (Berlin, 1995) 60–92.

> Metatron is the Prince over all princes, and stands before him who is exalted above all gods. He goes beneath the Throne of Glory, where he has a great heavenly tabernacle of light, and brings out the deafening fire, and puts it in the ears of the holy creatures, so that they should not hear the sound of the utterance that issues from the mouth of the Almighty.[4]

This passage portrays the translated patriarch as a heavenly priest in the celestial tabernacle located beneath God's *Kavod*. Along with the reference to Metatron's role as the sacerdotal servant, the text also alludes to another, more enigmatic tradition in which this angel is depicted as the one who inserts «the deafening fire» into the ears of the *hayyot* so the holy creatures will not be harmed by the voice of the Almighty. This reference might allude to another distinctive role of the exalted angel, to his office of the celestial choirmaster, that is, one who directs the angelic liturgy taking place before the Throne of Glory. The tradition attested in *3 Enoch* 15B, however, does not explicate this role of Metatron, most likely because of the fragmentary nature of this passage which is considered by scholars as a late addition to *Sefer Hekhalot*.[5] A similar description in *Synopse* 390[6] appears to have preserved better the original tradition about Metatron's unique liturgical role. The text relates:

> One *hayyah* rises above the seraphim and descends upon the tabernacle of the youth (משכן הנער) whose name is Metatron, and says in a great voice, a voice of sheer silence: «The Throne of Glory is shining». Suddenly the angels fall silent. The watchers and the holy ones become quiet. They are silent, and are pushed into the river of fire. The *hayyot* put their faces on the ground, and this youth whose name is Metatron brings the fire of deafness and puts it into their ears so that they could not hear the sound of God's speech or the ineffable name. The youth whose name is Metatron

[4] Alexander, 3 Enoch… 303.

[5] The literary integrity of *Sefer Hekhalot* is a complicated issue. The form of the work in the major manuscripts demonstrates «clear signs of editing». Scholars observe that «*3 Enoch* has arisen through the combination of many separate traditions: it tends to break down into smaller "self-contained" units which probably existed prior to their incorporation into the present work… It is not the total product of a single author at particular point in time, but the deposits of a "school tradition" which incorporates elements from widely different periods» (Alexander, 3 Enoch… 223). Alexander also observes that «an inspection of the textual tradition shows that chapters 3–15/16, which describe the elevation of Enoch, circulated as an independent tract… and it is intrinsically probable that these chapters formed the core round which the longer recensions grew» (Alexander, The Historical Settings of the Hebrew Book of Enoch… 156–157). The detailed discussion of the literary character of *3 Enoch* and its possible transmission history transcends the boundaries of current investigation.

[6] MS New York JTS 8128.

> then invokes, in seven voices (שהנער ששמו מטטרון מזכיר באות׳ שעה בשבעה קולות), his living, pure, honored, awesome, holy, noble, strong, beloved, mighty, powerful name.[7]

Here again the themes of Metatron's priesthood in the heavenly tabernacle and his duty of bringing the fire of deafness to the *hayyot* are conflated. This passage also indicates that Metatron is not only the one who protects and prepares the heavenly hosts for their praise to the deity,[8] but also the choirmaster who himself conducts the liturgical ceremony by invoking the divine name. The passage underlines the extraordinary scope of Metatron's own vocal abilities that allow him to invoke the deity's name in seven voices. Yet the portrayal of this celestial choirmaster intentionally «deafening» the members of his own choir might appear puzzling. A close examination of Hekhalot liturgical theology may however help clarify the paradoxal imagery. Peter Schäfer points out that in the Hekhalot writings «the heavenly praise is directed solely toward God» since «for all others who hear it — men as well as angels — it can be destructive».[9] As an example, Schäfer refers to a passage from *Hekhalot Rabbati* which offers a chain of warnings about the grave dangers encountered by those who dare to hear the angelic praise.[10] James Davila's recent study also confirms the importance of the motif of the dangerous encounters in the course of the heavenly worship in Hekhalot liturgical settings.[11]

This motif may constitute one of the main reasons for Metatron's preventive ritual of putting the deafening fire into the ears of the holy creatures.[12] It

---

[7] P. Schäfer, with M. Schlüter and H. G. von Mutius, Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur (Tübingen, 1981) (TSAJ, 2) 164.

[8] Another Hekhalot passage attested in *Synopse* § 385 also elaborates the liturgical role of the exalted angel: «…when the youth enters below the Throne of Glory, God embraces him with a shining face. All the angels gather and address God as 'the great, mighty, awesome God,' and they praise God three times a day by means of the youth (ומשבחים הק׳ב׳ה׳ שלשה פעמים בכל יום על יד הנער)…». Schäfer, Synopse… 162–163.

[9] Schäfer, Hidden and Manifest God… 25.

[10] *Synopse* 104 reads: «The voice of the first one: one who hears [this] voice, will immediately go mad and tumble down. The voice of the second one: everyone who hears it, immediately goes astray and does not return. The voice of the third one: one who hears [this] voice is struck by cramps and he dies immediately…». Schäfer, Hidden and Manifest God… 25.

[11] On this motif of the dangerous encounters with the divine in the Hekhalot literature, see J. R. Davila, Descenders to the Chariot: The People Behind the Hekhalot Literature (Leiden, 2001) (SJSJ, 70) 136–139.

[12] It appears that the angelic hosts must be protected, not for the whole course of the celestial liturgy, but only during the invocation of the divine name. Cf. M. S. Cohen, The Shiʿur Qomah: Texts and Recensions (Tübingen, 1985) (TSAJ, 9) 162–163.

is also helpful to realize that Youth-Metatron's role of safeguarding the angelic hosts stems directly from his duties as the liturgical servant and the director of angelic hosts.

It should be stressed that while Enoch-Metatron's liturgical office plays a prominent role in the Merkabah lore, this tradition appears to be absent in early Enochic texts, including the compositions collected in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Book of Giants*. Despite this apparent absence, this study will argue that the roots of Enoch-Metatron's liturgical imagery can be traced to the Second Temple Enochic lore, namely, to *2 Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse, apparently written in the first century CE. Some traditions found in this text appear to serve as the initial background for the developments of the future liturgical role of Enoch-Metatron as the celestial choirmaster. This study will focus on investigating these developments.

Priestly Role of the Seventh Antediluvian Patriarch in Early Enochic Traditions

Before this study proceeds to a detailed analysis of the liturgical role of the translated patriarch in *2 Enoch* and the Merkabah tradition, a brief introduction to the priestly and liturgical function of the seventh antediluvian hero in the pseudepigraphical materials is needed.

In early Enochic booklets the seventh antediluvian patriarch is closely associated with the celestial sanctuary located, as in the later Merkabah lore, in the immediate proximity to the Divine Throne. Enoch's affiliations with the heavenly Temple in the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 En.* 1–36), the *Book of Dreams* (*1 En.* 83–90), and the book of *Jubilees* can be seen as the gradual evolution from the implicit references to his heavenly priesthood in the earliest Enochic materials to a more overt recognition and description of his sacerdotal function in the later ones. While later Enochic traditions attested in the book of *Jubilees* unambiguously point to Enoch's priestly role by referring to his incense sacrifice in the celestial sanctuary, the earlier associations of the patriarch with the heavenly Temple hinted at in the *Book of the Watchers* took the form of rather enigmatic depictions. A certain amount of exegetical work is, therefore, required to discern the proper meaning of these initial associations of the patriarch with the celestial sanctuary.

Martha Himmelfarb's research helps to clarify Enoch's possible connections with the celestial sanctuary in the *Book of the Watchers*, the account of which appears to fashion the ascension of the seventh antediluvian patriarch to the Throne of Glory as a visitation of the heavenly Temple.[13] *1 Enoch* 14.9–18 reads:

[13] M. Himmelfarb, The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of the Watchers, and the Wisdom of Ben Sira // Sacred Places and Profane Spaces:

> And I proceeded until I came near to *a wall* which was built of hailstones, and a tongue of fire surrounded it, and it began to make me afraid. And I went into the tongue of fire and came near to *a large house* which was built of hailstones, and the wall of that house (was) like a mosaic (made) of hailstones, and its floor (was) snow. Its roof (was) like the path of the stars and flashes of lightning, and among them (were) fiery Cherubim, and their heaven (was like) water. And (there was) a fire burning around its wall, and its door was ablaze with fire. And I went into that house, and (it was) hot as fire and cold as snow, and there was neither pleasure nor life in it. Fear covered me and trembling, I fell on my face. And I saw in the vision, and behold, *another house*, which was larger that the former, and all its doors (were) open before me, and (it was) built of a tongue of fire. And in everything it so excelled in glory and splendor and size that I am unable to describe for you its glory and its size. And its floor (was) fire, and above (were) lightning and the path of the stars, and its roof also (was) a burning fire. And I looked and I saw in it a high throne, and its appearance (was) like ice and its surrounds like the shining sun and the sound of Cherubim.[14]

Commenting on this passage, Himmelfarb draws attention to the description of the celestial edifices which Enoch encounters in his approach to the Throne. She notes that the Ethiopic text reports that, in order to reach God's Throne, the patriarch passes through three celestial constructions: a wall, an outer house, and an inner house. The Greek version of this narrative mentions a house instead of a wall. Himmelfarb observes that «more clearly in the Greek, but also in the Ethiopic this arrangement echoes the structure of the earthly temple with its vestibule (אולם), sanctuary (היכל), and holy of holies (דביר)».[15] God's Throne is located in the innermost chamber of this heavenly structure and is represented by a throne of cherubim. It can be seen as a heavenly counterpart to the cherubim found in the Holy of Holies in the

---

Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam / Ed. J. Scott, P. Simpson-Housley (New York, 1991) 63–78; idem, Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple // *SBLSP* 26 (1987) 210–217. Himmelfarb's research draws on the previous publications of J. Maier and G. W. E. Nickelsburg; cf. J. Maier, Das Gefährdungsmotiv bei der Himmelsreise in der jüdischen Apocalyptik und «Gnosis» // *Kairos* 5.1 (1963) 18–40 (23); idem, Vom Kultus zur Gnosis: Studien zur Vor-und Frühgeschichte der «Judischen Gnosis». Bundeslade, Gottesthron und Märkabah (Salzburg, 1964) (Kairos, 1) 127–128; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee // *JBL* 100 (1981) 575–600 (576–582). Cf. also H. Kvanvig, Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man (Neukirchen—Vluyn, 1988) (WMANT, 61) 101–102; Halperin, The Faces of the Chariot… 81.

[14] M. Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch. 2 vols (Oxford, 1978) Vol. 1. 50–52; Vol. 2. 98–99.

[15] Himmelfarb, Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple… 210.

Jerusalem Temple.[16] In drawing parallels between the descriptions of the heavenly Temple in the *Book of the Watchers* and the features of the earthly sanctuary, Himmelfarb observes that the «fiery cherubim» which Enoch sees on the ceiling of the first house (Ethiopic) or middle house (Greek) of the heavenly structure represent, not the cherubim of the divine Throne, but images that recall the figures on the hangings on the wall of the terrestrial tabernacle mentioned in Exod. 26:1, 31; 36:8, 35 or possibly the figures which, according 1 Kgs 6:29, 2 Chron. 3:7 and Ezek. 41:15–26, were engraved on the walls of the earthly Temple.[17]

Several words must be said about the servants of the heavenly sanctuary depicted in *1 Enoch* 14. Himmelfarb observes that the priests of the heavenly Temple in the *Book of the Watchers* appear to be represented by angels, since the author of the text depicts them as the ones «standing before God's Throne in the heavenly temple».[18] She also points to the possibility that in the *Book of the Watchers* the patriarch himself in the course of his ascent becomes a priest[19]

[16] One comment must be made about the early traditions and sources that may lie behind the descriptions of the upper sanctuary in *1 En.* 14. Scholars observe that the idea of heaven as a temple was not invented by the author of the *Book of the Watchers* since the concept of the heavenly temple as a heavenly counterpart of the earthly sanctuary was widespread in the ancient Near East and appears in a number of biblical sources. Cf. Himmelfarb, The Temple and the Garden of Eden… 68. Students of Jewish priestly traditions previously noted that the existence of such a conception of the heavenly sanctuary appears to become increasingly important in the times of religious crises when the earthly sanctuaries were either destroyed or «defiled» by «improper» rituals or priestly successions. For an extensive discussion of this subject, see B. Ego *et al.* (eds.), Gemeinde ohne Tempel / Community Without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum (Tübingen, 1999) (WUNT, 118); R. Elior, From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines: Prayer and Sacred Song in the Hekhalot Literature and Its Relation to Temple Traditions // *JSQ* 4 (1997) 217–267; idem, The Priestly Nature of the Mystical Heritage in Heykalot Literature // Expérience et écriture mystiques dans les religions du livre: Actes d'un colloque international tenu par le Centre d'études juives Université de Paris IV-Sorbonne 1994 / Ed. R. B. Fenton, R. Goetschel (Leiden, 2000) (EJM, 22) 41–54.

[17] Himmelfarb, Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple… 211.

[18] Ibid. David Halperin also supports this position. In his view, «the angels, barred from the inner house, are the priests of Enoch's heavenly Temple. The high priest must be Enoch himself, who appears in the celestial Holy of Holies to procure forgiveness for holy beings» (Haplerin, The Faces of the Chariot… 82).

[19] Halperin's studies also stress the apocalyptic priestly function of Enoch in the *Book of the Watchers*. He observes that «Daniel and Enoch share an image, perhaps drawn from the hymnic tradition of merkabah exegesis (think of the Angelic liturgy), of God surrounded by multitudes of angels. But, in the Holy of Holies, God sits alone… The angels, barred from the inner house, are the priests of Enoch's heavenly

similarly to the angels».[20] In this perspective, the angelic status of the patriarch and his priestly role[21] are viewed as mutually interconnected. Himmelfarb stresses that «the author of the *Book of the Watchers* claims angelic status for Enoch through his service in the heavenly temple» since «the ascent shows him passing through the outer court of the temple and the sanctuary to the door of the holy of holies, where God addresses him with his own mouth».[22] It is important for our investigation to note that, despite the fact that Enoch appears to be envisioned as an angel by the authors of the text, nothing is said about his leading role in the angelic liturgy.

The traditions about the seventh patriarch's heavenly priesthood are not confined solely to the materials found in the *Book of the Watchers*, since they are attested in other *1 Enoch*'s materials, including the *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 En.* 85–90).

It is noteworthy that, whereas in the *Book of the Watchers* Enoch's associations with the heavenly Temple are clothed with rather ambiguous imagery, his depictions in the *Animal Apocalypse* do not leave any serious doubts that

---

Temple. The high priest must be Enoch himself, who appears in the celestial Holy of Holies to procure forgiveness for holy beings» (Haplerin, The Faces of the Chariot… 81–82).

[20] Himmelfarb, Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple… 213.

[21] George Nickelsburg's earlier study on the temple symbolism in *1 En.* 14 provides some important additional details relevant to our ongoing discussion. Nickelsburg argues that Enoch's «active» involvement in the vision of the Lord's Throne, when he passes through the chambers of the celestial sanctuary, might indicate that the author(s), of the *Book of the Watchers* perceived him as a servant associated with the activities in these chambers. Nickelsburg points to the fact that Enoch's vision of the Throne in the *Book of the Watchers* is «qualitatively different from that described in the biblical throne visions» by way of the new active role of its visionary. This new, active participation of Enoch in the vision puts *1 En.* 14 closer to later Merkabah accounts which are different from biblical visions. Nickelsburg stresses that in the biblical throne visions, the seer is passive or, at best, his participation is reactional. In contrast, in the Merkabah accounts, Enoch appears to be actively involved in his vision. In Nickelsburg's view, the verbal forms of the narrative («I *drew near* the wall», «I *went into* that house»), serve as further indications of the active «participation» of the seer in the visionary «reality» of the heavenly Throne/Temple. On the other hand, biblical visions are not completely forgotten by Enochic authors and provide an important exegetical framework for *1 En.* 14. Comparing the Enochic vision with the Ezekelian account of the temple, Nickelsburg suggests that the Enochic narrative also represents a vision of the temple, but, in this case, the heavenly one. He argues that «the similarities to Ezek. 40–48, together with other evidence, indicate that Enoch is describing his ascent to the heavenly temple and his progress through its *temenos* to the door of the holy of holies, where the chariot throne of God is set» (Nickelsburg, Enoch, Levi, and Peter… 579–581).

[22] Himmelfarb, Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple… 212.

some of the early Enochic traditions understood Enoch to be intimately connected with the heavenly sanctuary.

Chapter 87 of *1 Enoch* portrays the patriarch taken by three angels from the earth and raised to a high tower, where he is expected to remain until he will see the judgment prepared for the Watchers and their earthly families. *1 Enoch* 87:3–4 reads:

> And those three who came out last took hold of me by my hand, and raised me from the generations of the earth, and lifted me on to a high place, and showed me *a tower* high above the earth, and all the hills were lower. And one said to me: «Remain here until you have seen everything which is coming upon these elephants and camels and asses, and upon the stars, and upon all the bulls».[23]

James VanderKam notes a significant detail in this description, namely, Enoch's association with a tower. He observes that this term[24] is reserved in the *Animal Apocalypse* for a Temple.[25] The association of the patriarch with the tower is long-lasting, and apparently he must have spent there a considerable amount of time, since the text does not say anything about Enoch's return to the earth again until the time of judgment. So the patriarch is depicted as present in the heavenly sanctuary for most of the *Animal Apocalypse*.[26]

Although the traditions about Enoch's associations with the heavenly Temple in the *Book of the Watchers* and in the *Animal Apocalypse* do not refer explicitly to his performance of the priestly duties, the account attested in the book of *Jubilees* explicitly makes this reference.

Jubilees 4:23 depicts Enoch to be taken from human society and placed in Eden[27] «for (his) greatness and honor».[28] The Garden is then defined as a

---

[23] Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 1. 294; Vol. 2. 198.

[24] Cf. *1 En.* 89:50: «And that house became large and broad, and for those sheep a high tower was built on that house for the Lord of the sheep; and that house was low, but the tower was raised up and high; and the Lord of the sheep stood on that tower, and they spread a full table before him» (Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 2. 208); *1 En.* 89.73: «And they began again to build, as before, and they raised up that tower, and it was called the high tower; and they began again to place a table before the tower, but all the bread on it (was), unclean and was not pure» (Ibid. 211).

[25] J. VanderKam, Enoch: A Man for All Generations (Columbia, SC, 1995) 117.

[26] Ibid.

[27] For Enoch's place in the heavenly Paradise, see *Testament of Benjamin* 10:6; *Apocalypse of Paul* 20; *Clementine Recognitions* 1:52; *Acts of Pilate* 25; and the *Ascension of Isaiah* 9:6. Cf. C. Rowland, Enoch // Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible / Ed. K. van der Toorn *et al.* (Leiden, 1999) 302.

[28] J. VanderKam, The Book of Jubilees. 2 vols. (Leuven, 1989) (CSCO, 510–511; Scriptores Aethiopici, 87–88) Vol. 2. 28.

sanctuary[29] and Enoch as one who is offering an incense sacrifice on the mountain of incense: «He burned the evening incense[30] of the sanctuary which is acceptable before the Lord on the mountain of incense».[31]

VanderKam suggests that here Enoch is depicted as one who «performs the rites of a priest in the temple».[32] Furthermore, he observes that Enoch's priestly duties represent a new element in «Enoch's expanding portfolio».[33]

The purpose of the aforementioned analysis was to demonstrate that, despite the fact that the early Enochic materials found in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* emphasize the patriarch's association with the heavenly sanctuary, they do not contain any references to his role in directing the celestial liturgy. Unlike the later Merkabah materials where the priestly duties of Enoch-Metatron are often juxtaposed with his liturgical activities, early Enochic lore does not link these two sacerdotal functions. Moreover, it appears that in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* Enoch does not play any leading role in the celestial liturgy. Thus, for example, in the *Book of the Similitudes* (*1 En.* 37–71), where the celestial liturgy plays an important part, the patriarch does not play any significant role (*1 En.* 39). Moreover, the text stresses that Enoch is unable to sustain the

[29] VanderKam argues that there are other indications that in the book *of Jubilees* Eden was understood as a sanctuary. As an example, he points to Jub. 3.9–14, which «derives the law from Lev 11 regarding when a women who has given birth may enter the sanctuary from the two times when Adam and Eve, respectively, went into the garden» (VanderKam, Enoch: A Man for All Generations… 117).

[30] One must note the peculiar details surrounding the depiction of Enoch's priestly duties in early Enochic lore. While the *Book of the Watchers* does not refer to any liturgical or sacrificial rituals of the patriarch, *Jubilees* depicts the patriarch offering incense to God. The absence of references to any animal sacrificial or liturgical practice in Enoch's sacerdotal duties might indicate that his office may have been understood by early Enochic traditions to be of the «divinatory angle», that is, as the office of oracle-priest, practiced also by the Mesopotamian diviners who, similarly to Enoch's preoccupation with incense, widely used the ritual of libanomancy, or smoke divination, a «practice of throwing cedar shavings onto a censer in order to observe the patterns and direction of the smoke» (M. S. Moore, The Balaam Traditions: Their Character and Development (Atlanta, GA, 1990) (SBLDS, 113) 43).

[31] VanderKam, The Book of Jubilees… Vol. 2. 28.

[32] VanderKam, Enoch: A Man for All Generations… 117.

[33] Ibid. Scholars point to the possible polemical nature of the patriarch's priestly role. Gabriele Boccaccini observes that «Enochians completely ignore the Mosaic torah and the Jerusalem Temple, that is the two tenets of the order of the universe». In his opinion, «the attribution to Enoch of priestly characteristics suggests the existence of a pure prediluvian, and pre-fall, priesthood and disrupts the foundation of the Zadokite priesthood, which claimed its origin in Aaron at the time of exodus, in an age that, for the Enochians, was already corrupted after the angelic sin and the flood» (G. Boccaccini, Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism (Grand Rapids, 1998) 74).

frightening «Presence» of the deity. In *1 Enoch* 39:14 the patriarch laments that during celestial liturgy his «face was transformed» until he was not able to see.[34] This lament makes clear that Enoch's capacities can in no way be compared with Metatron-Youth's potentialities which are able not only to sustain the terrifying Presence of the deity but also to protect others, including the angelic hosts during the celestial liturgy.

These conceptual developments indicate that in the early Enochic materials the leading role of the translated patriarch in the sacerdotal settings remains solely priestly, but not liturgical. Unlike the later Merkabah materials where the theme of the celestial sanctuary (the tabernacle of the Youth) is often conflated with Metatron's role as the celestial choirmaster, the early Enochic materials associated with *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* show only one side of the story. Our study must now proceed to the testimonies about Metatron's priestly and liturgical activities in the Hekhalot and the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials.

Tabernacle of the Youth: Priestly and Liturgical Roles of Enoch-Metatron in the Merkabah Tradition

It has been already mentioned that, in contrast to the early Enochic booklets which do not provide any hints as to Enoch's leading role in the heavenly liturgy, in the Merkabah tradition the priestly role of Enoch-Metatron is closely intertwined with his pivotal place in the course of the angelic worship. Since both of these sacerdotal functions are closely interconnected, before we proceed to a detailed analysis of the liturgical imagery associated with this exalted angel, we must explore Metatron's priestly duties, which in many respects echo and develop further the earlier Enochic traditions about the sacerdotal duties of the seventh antediluvian hero.

Heavenly High Priest

While the early Enochic materials depict the seventh antediluvian patriarch as a newcomer who just arrives to his new appointment in the heavenly sanctuary, the Merkabah materials portray Metatron as an established celestial citizen who is firmly placed in his sacerdotal office and even possesses his own heavenly sanctuary that now bears his name. Thus in the passage found in *Merkabah Shelemah* the heavenly tabernacle is called the «tabernacle of Metatron» (משכן מטטרון). In the tradition preserved in *Num. R.* 12.12, the heavenly sanctuary again is associated with one of Metatron's designations and is named the «tabernacle of the Youth» (משכן הנער):[35]

[34] Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch... Vol. 2. 127.

[35] It should be noted that the expression «the tabernacle of the Youth» occurs also in the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials. For a detailed analysis of the Metatron imagery in this

> R. Simon expounded: When the Holy One, blessed be He, told Israel to set up the Tabernacle He intimated to the ministering angels that they also should make a Tabernacle, and the one below was erected the other was erected on high. The latter was *the tabernacle of the youth* (משכן הנער) whose name was Metatron, and therein he offers up the souls of the righteous to atone for Israel in the days of their exile.[36]

This close association between the exalted angel and the upper sanctuary becomes quite widespread in the Hekhalot lore where the celestial Temple is often called the tabernacle of the Youth.[37]

A significant detail of the rabbinic and Hekhalot descriptions of the tabernacle of the Youth is that this structure is placed in the immediate proximity to the Throne, more precisely right beneath the seat of Glory.[38] As mentioned in the introduction, *3 Enoch* 15B locates Enoch-Metatron's «great heavenly tabernacle of light» beneath the Throne of Glory.[39] This tradition appears to be not confined solely to the description attested in *3 Enoch* since several Hekhalot passages depict Youth (who often is identified there with Metatron)[40] as the one who emerges from beneath the Throne.[41] The proximity of the tabernacle to *Kavod* recalls the early Enochic materials, more specifically *1 Enoch* 14, where the patriarch's visitation of the celestial sanctuary is described as his approach to God's Throne. Both Enochic and Hekhalot traditions seem to allude here to Enoch-Metatron's role as the celestial high priest since he approaches the realm where the ordinary angelic or human creatures

---

tradition, see Cohen, Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism… 124–132.

[36] H. Freedman, S. Maurice, Midrash Rabbah. 10 vols (London, 1961) Vol. 5. 482–483.

[37] Cf. *Sefer Haqqomah* 155–164; *Sid. R.* 37–46.

[38] *3 En.* 8.1: «R. Ishmael said: Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, said to me: Before the Holy One, blessed be he, set me to serve the throne of glory…». (Alexander, 3 Enoch… 262). Metatron's prominent role might be also reflected in the fragment found on one magic bowl where he is called איסרא רבא דכורסיה («the great prince of the throne»); see C. Gordon, Aramaic Magical Bowls in the Istanbul and Baghdad Museums // *Archiv Orientální* 6 (1934) 319–334 (328).

[39] Alexander, 3 Enoch… 303.

[40] On the title «Youth» in the Hekhalot literature, see Davila, Melchizedek, the «Youth», and Jesus… 254–266, and Halperin, Faces of the Chariot… 491–494.

[41] Cf., for example, *Synopse* 385: «when *the youth enters beneath the throne of glory* (נכנס הנער לתחת כסא הכבוד)» (Schäfer, Synopse… 162). Another text preserved in the *Cairo Genizah* also depicts the «youth» as emerging from his sacerdotal place in the immediate Presence of the deity: «Now, see the youth, who is going forth to meet you *from behind the throne of glory*. Do not bow down to him, because his crown is like the crown of his King…» (P. Schäfer, Geniza-Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur (Tübingen, 1984) (TSAJ, 6) 2b.13–14).

are not allowed to enter, namely, the realm of the immediate Presence of the deity, the place of the Holy of Holies, which is situated behind the veil, represented by heavenly (פרגוד)[42] or terrestrial (פרכת) curtains. Metatron's service behind the heavenly curtain parallels the unique function of the earthly high priest who alone was allowed to enter behind the veil of the terrestrial sanctuary.[43] It has been mentioned that the possible background of this unique role of Metatron can be traced to the Enochic materials, more specifically to *1 Enoch* 14 where the patriarch alone appears in the celestial Holy of Holies while the other angels are barred from the inner house. This depiction also correlates with the Hekhalot evidence according to which only the Youth, that is, Metatron, similarly to the earthly high priest, is allowed to serve before as well as behind the heavenly veil. The inscription on one Mandean bowl describes Metatron as the attendant «who serves before the Curtain».[44] Philip Alexander observes that this definition «may be linked to the Hekhalot tradition about Metatron as the heavenly High Priest … and certainly alludes to his status as "Prince of the Divine Presence"».[45] It is true that Metatron's role as the Prince of the Divine Presence or the Prince of the Face (*Sar ha-Panim*) cannot be separated from his priestly and liturgical duties since both the tabernacle of this exalted angel and the divine liturgy that he is conducting are situated in the immediate proximity to God's Presence, also known as his Face. In relation to our investigation of the liturgical imagery, it is worth noting that by virtue of being God's *Sar ha-Panim* Youth-Metatron can unconditionally approach the Presence of the deity without harm for himself, a unique privilege denied to the rest of the created order. He is also allowed to go behind the Curtain and behold the Face of God,[46] as well as to hear the voice of the deity. This is why he is able to protect the *hayyot* against the harmful effects of the Divine Presence in the course of the angelic liturgy. Such imagery points to the fact that Metatron's bold approach to the Divine Presence is predetermined, not only by his special role as the celestial High Priest, but also by his privileges in the office of the Prince of the Divine Presence.

[42] On the imagery of the celestial curtain, see also *b*. Yoma 77a; *b*. Ber. 18b; *3 En.* 45.1.

[43] On the celestial curtain *Pargod* as the heavenly counterpart of the *paroket*, the veil of the Jerusalem Temple, see D. Halperin, The Merkabah in Rabbinic Literature (New Haven, 1980) (AOS, 62) 169 n. 99; C. R. A. Morray-Jones, A Transparent Illusion: The Dangerous Vision of Water in Hekhalot Mysticism (Leiden, 2002) 164–168.

[44] W. S. McCullough, Jewish and Mandean Incantation Texts in the Royal Ontario Museum (Toronto, 1967) D 5–6.

[45] Alexander, The Historical Settings of the Hebrew Book of Enoch… 166.

[46] The passage found in *Synopse* 385 relates: «when the youth enters beneath the throne of glory, God embraces him with a shining face».

It should be noted that, in contrast to the early Enochic traditions which hesitate to name explicitly the exalted patriarch as the high priest, the Merkabah materials directly apply this designation to Metatron. Rachel Elior observes that Metatron appears in the *Genizah* documents as a high priest who offers sacrifices on the heavenly altar.[47] She draws attention to the important testimony attested in one *Cairo Genizah* text which labels Metatron as the high priest and the chief of the priests. The text reads:

> I adjure you [Metatron], more beloved and dear than all heavenly beings, [Faithful servant] of the God of Israel, the High Priest (כהן גדול), chief of [the priest]s (ראש [הכהני]ם), you who poss[ess seven]ty names; and whose name[is like your Master's] ... Great Prince, who is appointed over the great princes, who is the head of all the camps.[48]

It is also noteworthy that Metatron's role as the heavenly high priest appears to be supported in the Hekhalot materials by the motif of the peculiar sacerdotal duties of the terrestrial protagonist of the Hekhalot literature, Rabbi Ishmael b. Elisha, to whom Metatron serves as an *angelus interpres*. In view of Enoch-Metatron sacerdotal affiliations, it is not coincidental that Rabbi Ishmael is the tanna who is attested in *b.* Ber. 7a as a high priest.[49] R. Elior observes that in *Hekhalot Rabbati* this rabbinic authority is portrayed in terms similar to those used in the Talmud, that is, as a priest burning an offering on the altar.[50] Other Hekhalot materials, including *3 Enoch*,[51] also often refer to R. Ishmael's priestly origins. The priestly features of this visionary might not only reflect the heavenly priesthood of Metatron[52] but also allude to the former

[47] Elior, From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines... 228.

[48] L. H. Schiffman, M. D. Swartz, Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts from the Cairo Genizah (Sheffield, 1992) (Semitic Texts and Studies, 1) 145–147, 151. On Metatron as the high priest, see ibid. 25–28, 145–147, 156–157; Elior, From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines... 299, n. 30. Al-Qirquisani alludes to the evidence from the Talmud about the priestly function of Metatron. See L. Ginzberg, The Legends of the Jews / Trans. H. Szold. 7 vols (Baltimore, 1998) Vol. 6. 74.

[49] Cf. also *b.* Ket. 105b; *b.* Hull. 49a.

[50] Elior, From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines... 225.

[51] Cf., e.g., *3 En.* 2.3: «Metatron replied, "He [R. Ishmael] is of the tribe of Levi, which presents the offering to his name. He is of the family of Aaron, whom the Holy One, blessed be he, chose to minister in his presence and on whose head he himself placed the priestly crown on Sinai"» (Alexander, 3 Enoch... 257).

[52] N. Deutsch observes that in *3 Enoch* «likewise, as the heavenly high priest, Metatron serves as the mythological prototype of Merkabah mystics such as Rabbi Ishmael. Metatron's role as a high priest highlights the functional parallel between the angelic vice regent and the human mystic (both are priests), whereas his transformation from a human being into an angel reflects an ontological process which may be repeated by mystics via their own enthronement and angelification» (N. Deutsch, Guardians of the Gate: Angelic Vice Regency in Late Antiquity (Leiden, 1999) (BSJS, 22) 34).

priestly duties of the patriarch Enoch known from *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, since some scholars note that «*3 Enoch* presents a significant parallelism between the ascension of Ishmael and the ascension of Enoch».[53]

Celestial Choirmaster

Unlike the early Enochic booklets that unveil only the patriarch's leading role in the priestly settings, the Merkabah materials emphasize another important dimension of his activities in the divine worship, namely, the liturgical aspect of his celestial duties. The passages from *3 Enoch* 15B and *Synopse* § 390 that began our investigation show that one of the features of Metatron's service in the heavenly realm involves his leadership over the angelic hosts delivering heavenly praise to the deity. Metatron is portrayed there not just as a servant in the celestial tabernacle or the heavenly high priest, but also as the leader of the heavenly liturgy. The evidences that unfold Metatron's liturgical role are not confined solely to the Hekhalot corpus, but can also be detected in another prominent literary stream associated with early Jewish mysticism which is represented by the *Shi*ᶜ*ur Qomah* materials. The passages found in the *Shi*ᶜ*ur Qomah* texts attest to a familiar tradition in which Metatron is posited as a liturgical servant. Thus, *Sefer Haqqomah* 155–164 reads:

> And (the) angels who are with him come and encircle the Throne of Glory. They are on one side and the (celestial) creatures are on the other side, and the Shekhinah is on the Throne of Glory in the center. And one creature goes up over the seraphim and descends on the tabernacle of the lad whose name is Metatron and says in a great voice, a thin voice of silence, «The Throne of Glory is glistening!» Immediately, the angels fall silent and the *ᶜirin* and the *qadushin* are still. They hurry and hasten into the river of fire. And the celestial creatures turn their faces towards the earth, and this lad whose name is Metatron, brings the fire of deafness and puts (it) in the ears of the celestial creatures so that they do not hear the sound of the speech of the Holy One, blessed be He, and the explicit name that the lad, whose name is Metatron, utters at that time in seven voices, in seventy voices, in living, pure, honored, holy, awesome, worthy, brave, strong, and holy name.[54]

A similar tradition can be found in *Siddur Rabbah* 37–46, another text associated with *Shi*ᶜ*ur Qomah* tradition, where the angelic Youth however is not identified with the angel Metatron:

> The angels who are with him come and encircle the (Throne of) Glory; they are on one side and the celestial creatures are on the other side, and the Shekhinah is in the center. And one creature ascends above the Throne

[53] Alexander, From Son of Adam to a Second God… 106–107.

[54] Cohen, The Shiᶜur Qomah… 162–164.

> of Glory and touches the seraphim and descends on the Tabernacle of the Lad and declares in a great voice, (which is also) a voice of silence, «The throne alone shall I exalt over him». The *ofanim* become silent (and) the seraphim are still. The platoons of *ʿirin* and *qadushin* are shoved into the River of Fire and the celestial creatures turn their faces downward, and the lad brings the fire silently and puts it in their ears so that they do not hear the spoken voice; he remains (thereupon) alone. And the lad calls Him, «the great, mighty and awesome, noble, strong, powerful, pure and holy, and the strong and precious and worthy, shining and innocent, beloved and wondrous and exalted and supernal and resplendent God».[55]

In reference to these materials M. Cohen notes that in the *Shiʿur Qomah* tradition Metatron's service in the heavenly tabernacle appears to be «entirely liturgical» and «is more the heavenly choirmaster and beadle than the celestial high priest».[56]

It is evident that the tradition preserved in *Sefer Haqqomah* cannot be separated from the microforms found in *Synopse* 390 and *3 Enoch* 15B since all these narratives are unified by a similar structure and terminology. All of them also emphasize the Youth's leading role in the course of the celestial service. It is also significant that Metatron's role as the one who is responsible for the protection and encouragement of the servants delivering praise to the deity is not confined only to the aforementioned passages, but finds support in the broader context of the Hekhalot and *Shiʿur Qomah* materials.[57]

Thus, in the Hekhalot corpus, Metatron's duties as the choirmaster or the celestial liturgical director appear to be applied, not only to his leadership over angelic hosts, but also over humans, specifically the visionaries who are lucky enough to overcome the angelic opposition and be admitted into the heavenly realm. In *3 En.* 1.9–10 Enoch-Metatron is depicted as the one who «prepares» one of such visionaries, Rabbi Ishmael, for singing praise to the Holy One:

> At once Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, came and revived me and raised me to my feet, but still I had no strength enough to sing a hymn before the glorious throne of the glorious King…[58]

---

[55] Ibid. On the relation of this passage to the Youth tradition see Davila, Melchizedek, the «Youth», and Jesus… 248–274.

[56] Cohen, The Shiʿur Qomah… 134.

[57] This tradition is not forgotten in the later Jewish mystical developments. Thus, Daniel Abrams notes that in *Sefer ha-Hashek* «Metatron commands the angels to praise the King of the Glory, and he is among them». Abrams, The Boundaries of Divine Ontology… 304.

[58] Alexander, 3 Enoch… 256. Peter Schäfer suggests that Ishmael's example stresses the connection between heavenly and earthly liturgies; cf. Schäfer, The Hidden and Manifest God… 132.

It is possible that these descriptions of Enoch-Metatron as the one who encourages angels and humans to perform heavenly praise in front of God's Presence might have their roots in early Second Temple materials. Our investigation must now turn to analyzing some of these early developments that might constitute the early background of the Merkabah liturgical imagery.

The Beginnings: Liturgical Role of Enoch in Slavonic Apocalypse

One of the texts which might contain early traces of Enoch-Metatron's liturgical imagery is *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*, the Jewish apocalypse, apparently written in the first century CE. In contrast to other early Enochic materials, such as *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, which emphasize only one side of the patriarch's heavenly service through the reference to Enoch's priestly activities, the Slavonic text appears to encompass both sacerdotal dimensions — priestly as well as liturgical. Allusions to the priestly office of the seventh antediluvian hero in the Slavonic text demonstrate marked difference in comparison with the testimonies found in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*. Thus, unlike the aforementioned Enochic tracts, *2 Enoch* does not associate the translated patriarch with any celestial structure that might remotely resemble the descriptions found in *1 Enoch* 14 and 87. On the other hand, the Slavonic text contains a number of other indirect testimonies that demonstrate that the authors of this apocalypse were cognizant of the patriarch's priestly role. Thus, scholars previously observed that Enoch's anointing with shining oil and his clothing into the luminous garments during his angelic metamorphosis in *2 Enoch* 22 appear to resemble the priestly vesture.[59] Another possible sacerdotal association comes from *2 Enoch* 67–69 where the descendents of the seventh antediluvian patriarch, including his son Methuselah, are depicted as the builders of the altar which is erected on the place where Enoch was taken up to heaven. The choice of the location for the terrestrial sanctuary might allude to the peculiar role of the patriarch in relation to the heavenly counterpart of this earthly structure. The Slavonic text also appears to refer to the sacerdotal office of Enoch by portraying the patriarch as the one who in *2 Enoch* 59 delivers the sacrificial instructions to his children. All these testimonies show that *2 Enoch*'s authors were familiar with the traditions about the priestly affiliations of the seventh antediluvian hero attested also in the early Enochic booklets. However, in contrast to these early materials that mention only Enoch's priestly role, the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse also appear to have

[59] M. Himmelfarb observes that «the combination of clothing and anointing suggests that the process by which Enoch becomes an angel is a heavenly version of priestly investiture» (M. Himmelfarb, Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses (New York—Oxford, 1993) 40).

knowledge about another prominent office of the translated patriarch — his liturgical activities and his role as the one who encourages and directs the celestial hosts in their daily praise of the creator.

Entertaining this possibility of the Enochic origins of Metatron's role as the leader of the divine worship, we must direct our attention to the passage found in *2 Enoch* 18 where the patriarch is depicted as the one who encourages the celestial Watchers to conduct liturgy before the face of God. The longer recension of *2 En.* 18.8–9 relates:

> And I [Enoch] said, «Why are you waiting for your brothers? And why don't you *perform the liturgy*[60] before the face of the Lord? Start up *your liturgy*,[61] and perform the liturgy before the face of the Lord, so that you do not enrage your Lord to the limit». And they responded to my recommendation, and they stood in four regiments in this heaven. And behold, while I was standing with those men, 4 trumpets trumpeted in unison with a great sound, and the Watchers burst into singing in unison. And their voice rose in front of the face of the Lord, piteously and touchingly.[62]

One can notice that the imagery of this account represents a vague sketch that only distantly alludes to the future prominent liturgical role of Enoch-Metatron. Yet here, for the first time in the Enochic tradition, the seventh antediluvian patriarch dares to assemble and direct the angelic creatures for their routine job of delivering praise to the deity. The choice of the angelic group, of course, is not coincidental since in various Enochic materials the patriarch is often described as a special envoy to the Watchers, the fallen angels, as well as their faithful celestial brothers.

It is significant that, despite the fact that in *2 Enoch* 18 the patriarch gives his advise to the angels situated in the Fifth Heaven, he repeatedly advises them to start liturgy «before the Face of the Lord», that is, in front of the divine *Kavod*, the exact location where Youth-Metatron will later conduct the heavenly worship of the angelic hosts in the *Shi*ᶜ*ur Qomah* and Hekhalot accounts.

The shorter recension of the Slavonic text[63] adds several significant details among which Enoch's advice to the Watchers to «perform the liturgy in

---

[60] Slav. **слоужите**. М. И. Соколов, Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий, VII: Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного / Тексты, латинский пер. и исследование. Посмертный труд автора приготовил к изд. М. Сперанский // *ЧОИДР* 4 (1910) 16.

[61] Slav. **слоужби ваше**. Соколов, Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе… 16.

[62] F. Andersen, 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 91–221 (132).

[63] The shorter recension of *2 En.* 18.8–9 reads: «'And why don't you perform the liturgy before the face of the Lord? Start up the former liturgy. Perform the liturgy in the name of fire (*vo imja ogne*), lest you annoy the Lord your God (so that), he throws

the name of fire»[64] can be found. This peculiar terminology involving the symbolism of fire appears to allude to the concepts found in the aforementioned Hekhalot liturgical accounts where the imagery of fire, in the form of the references to the *deafening fire* and angels «bathing» in the fire, plays an important role. The shorter recension also stresses the importance of Enoch's leading role, specifically underscoring that the angels needed «the earnestness» of his recommendation.[65]

The reference of *2 Enoch* 18 to the later Youth-Metatron office as the heavenly choirmaster does not appear to be happenstance, since the Slavonic apocalypse alludes to some additional features that recall the later Merkabah liturgical developments. The present study will concentrate on two of such characteristics that enhance Enoch's connection with his newly acquired liturgical office. Both of them are linked to Enoch-Metatron's designations, namely, his titles as «Youth» and the «Servant of the Divine Presence», which appear here for the first time in the Enochic tradition. These titles seem to have direct connection to the liturgical imagery found in the Hekhalot and *Shi^{c}ur Qomah* materials where the offices of the Youth and *Sar ha-Panim* help unfold Metatron's liturgical activities. Our study must now proceed to the investigation of these two titles in *2 Enoch's* materials.

The Servant of God's Face

It has been already observed that Metatron's sacerdotal and liturgical duties cannot be separated from his office as the *Sar ha-Panim*, the one who can approach God's Presence without limit and hesitation. It is not surprising that in *2 Enoch*, which attests to the origins of Enoch-Metatron's liturgical imagery, one can also find for the first time in the Enochic tradition an explicit reference to the patriarch's role as the Servant of the Divine Presence.[66]

Hugo Odeberg may well be the first scholar to have discovered the characteristics of «the Prince of the Presence» in the long recension of *2 Enoch*. He successfully demonstrated in his synopsis of the parallel passages from *2* and *3 Enoch* that the phrase «stand before my face forever» found in the

you down from this place.' And they heeded the earnestness of my recommendation, and they stood in four regiments in heaven. And behold, while I was standing, they sounded with 4 trumpets in unison, and the Grigori began to perform the liturgy as with one voice. And their voices rose up in the Lord's presence» (Andersen, 2 Enoch… 133).

[64] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 133.

[65] Ibid.

[66] Although the imagery of angels of the Presence was widespread in the pseudepigraphical writings and specifically in the early Enochic pseudepigrapha, it was never explicitly identified with the seventh antediluvian patriarch. *1 En.* 40:9, however, mentions the four «Faces» or «Presences» of Ezek. 1:6 identifying them with the four principal angels: Michael, Phanuel, Raphael, and Gabriel.

Slavonic apocalypse does not serve there merely as a typical Hebraism, «to be in the presence», but establishes the angelic status of Enoch as Metatron, the Prince of the Presence, שר הפנים.[67] In *2 Enoch* therefore the patriarch is depicted not as one of the visonaries who has only temporary access to the Divine Presence, but as an angelic servant permanently installed in the office of the *Sar ha-Panim*. The title itself is developed primarily in chs. 21–22, which are devoted to the description of the Throne of Glory. In these chapters, one can find several promises coming from the mouth of archangel Gabriel and the deity himself that the translated patriarch will now stand in front God's face forever.[68]

In terms of the theological background of the problem, the title seems to be connected with the image of Metatron in the Merkabah tradition,[69] which was crystallized in the classical Hekhalot literature.[70] According to the leg-

[67] Odeberg, 3 Enoch... 55.

[68] Cf. *2 En.* 21:3: «And the Lord send one of his glorious ones, the archangel Gabriel. And he said to me "Be brave, Enoch! Don't be frightened! Stand up, and come with me and stand in front of the face of the Lord forever"». *2 En.* 22:6: «And the Lord said to his servants, sounding them out: "Let Enoch join in and stand in front of my face forever!"» *2 En.* 36:3: «Because a place has been prepared for you, and you will be in front of my face from now and forever» (Andersen, 2 Enoch... 136, 138, 161).

[69] Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism... 67.

[70] On the debates about the various stages in the development of the Merkabah tradition, see Alexander, The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch... 173–80; D. J. Halperin, A New Edition of the Hekhalot Literature // *JAOS* 104.3 (1984) 543–552; idem, The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision... 359–363; Himmelfarb, Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses... 106–114; idem, The Experience of the Visionary and the Genre in the Ascension of Isaiah 6–11 and the Apocalypse of Paul // *Semeia* 36 (1986) 97–111; idem, The Practice of Ascent in the Ancient Mediterranean World // Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys / Ed. J. J. Collins, M. Fishbane (Albany, NY, 1995) 123–137 (126–128); Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism... 67, 98–123; Maier, Vom Kultus zur Gnosis... 128–146; P. Schäfer, Prolegomena zu einer kritischen Edition und Analyse der Merkava Rabba // *FJB* 5 (1977) 65–99; idem, Die Beschwöerung des sar ha-panim, Kritische Edition und Übersetzung // *FJB* 6 (1978) 107–145; idem, Aufbau und redaktionelle Identität der Hekhalot Zutarti // *JJS* 33 (1982) 569–582; idem, Tradition and Redaction in Hekhalot Literature // *JSJ* 14 (1983) 172–181; idem, Engel und Menschen in der Hekhalot-Literatur // idem, Hekhalot-Studien (Tübingen, 1988) (TSAJ, 19) 250–276 (258, 264–265); idem, The Aim and Purpose of Early Jewish Mysticism: Gershom Scholem Reconsidered // Ibid. 277–295; idem, The Hidden and Manifest God... 150–155; Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism... 43–44; M. D. Swartz, Scholastic Magic: Ritual and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism (Princeton, NJ, 1996) 29, 153–157; 170–172; 210–212; E. E. Urbach, The Traditions about Merkavah Mysticism in the Tannaitic Period //

end of the Hekhalot tradition, Enoch «was raised to the rank of first of the angels and שר הפנים (literally, "Prince of the Divine Face", or "Divine Presence")».[71] *3 Enoch*, as well as other texts of Hekhalot tradition, have a well-developed theology connected with this title.

Youth

It has been already shown that in the descriptions related to Metatron's sacerdotal and liturgical duties he often appears under the title «Youth». Such persistence of the Hekhalot writers who repeatedly connect this designation with Metatron's priestly and liturgical service may be explained by one of the possible meanings of the Hebrew term נער, which also can be translated as «servant». It should be stressed that the sobriquet «Youth» is never applied to designate the seventh patriarch in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Genesis Apocryphon*, and the *Book of Giants*. Yet, it is significant that in some manuscripts of *Slavonic Enoch* for the first time in the Enochic tradition the seventh antediluvian patriarch becomes associated with this prominent Metatron's title.[72] Despite the fact that this designation occurs only in several Slavonic manuscripts, the author of the recent English translation, Francis Andersen, considered this reading as the original.[73] He was also the first scholar to propose that Enoch's designation as «Youth» in *2 Enoch* recalls the identical title of Metatron attested in *3 Enoch* and other Hekhalot writings.[74] In his commentary to the English translation of *2 Enoch* in *OTP*, Andersen wrote:

> The remarkable reading *yunoše* [youth], clearly legible in A, supports the evidence of V, which has this variant four times (not here), and of other MSS, that there was a tradition in which Enoch was addressed in this way. The similarity to the vocative *enoše* [Enoch] might explain the variant as purely scribal slip. But it is surprising that it is only in address, never in description, that the term is used. The variant *jenokhu* is rare. There is no phonetic reason why the first vowel should change to *ju*; *junokhu* is never found. But it cannot be a coincidence that this title is identical with that of Enoch (= Metatron) in *3 Enoch*.[75]

Studies in Mysticism and Religion Presented to Gershom G. Scholem on His Seventieth Birthday by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends / Ed. E. E. Urbach, R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, Ch. Wirszubski (Jerusalem, 1967) 1–28 (Hebrew).

[71] Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism… 67.

[72] Slav. ѭношѥ.

[73] Professor Francis Andersen reassured me in a private communication about the originality of this reading, referring to it as «powerful evidence».

[74] See, for example, §§ 384, 385, 390, 396 in Schäfer, Synopse… 162–163, 164–165, 166–167.

[75] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 118–119.

The employment of the designation «Youth» in the Slavonic apocalypse cannot be separated from its future usage in the later Merkabah materials, since the context of the usage of the sobriquet is very similar in both traditions. Thus, according to the Merkabah tradition, God likes to address Enoch-Metatron as «Youth». In *3 Enoch* 3, when R. Ishmael asks Metatron, «What is your name?» Metatron answers, «I have seventy names, corresponding to the seventy nations of the world ... however, my King calls me "Youth"».[76] The designation of the translated patriarch as «Youth» seems to signify here a special relationship between the deity and Metatron. One can see the beginning of this tradition already in *2 Enoch* where in ch. 24 of the shorter recension the following tradition can be found:

> And the Lord called me (Enoch) and he placed me to himself closer than Gabriel. And I did obeisance to the Lord. And the Lord spoke to me «Whatever you see, Youth, things standing still and moving about were brought to perfection by me and not even to angels have I explained my secrets...as I am making them known to you today...»[77]

It is significant that the title «Youth» here is tied to the motif of Enoch's superiority over angels and his leading role in the celestial community which will play later a prominent role in the Merkabah liturgical accounts. It is possible that the title «Youth» also signifies here Enoch's role as a very special servant of the deity who has immediate access to God's Presence which is even closer than that of the archangels. In this context it is not surprising that in the shorter recension of *2 En.* 24.1–2 the patriarch is depicted as the one who has the seat left[78] of the Lord, «closer than Gabriel», that is, next to God.

Finally, we must note that several important readings of «Youth» in the materials associated with *Slavonic Enoch* can be found in the Vienna Codex.[79] In this manuscript Enoch is addressed by the Lord as «Youth»[80] in the

---

[76] Alexander, 3 Enoch... 257.

[77] Соколов, Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе... 90–91. Andersen, 2 Enoch... 119.

[78] The assigning of the left side to the vice-regent might be seen as puzzling. Martin Hengel, however, rightly observes that this situation can be explained as the correction of the Christian scribe(s), who «reserved this place for Christ» (M. Hengel, Studies in Early Christology (Edinburg, 1995) 193). Hengel points to a similar situation in the *Ascension of Isaiah* where the angel of the holy spirit is placed at the left hand of God.

[79] I want to express my deep gratitude to Professor Francis Andersen who generously shared with me the microfilms and photographs of MSS V, R, and J.

[80] Unfortunately, Friedrich Repp's research on the Vienna Codex failed to discern the proper meaning of «Youth» in this important manuscript. See F. Repp, Textkritische Untersuchungen zum Henoch-Apokryph des co. slav. 125 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek // *Wiener slavistische Jahrbuch* 10 (1963) 58–68 (65).

context of angelic veneration. The passage from *2 Enoch* 22 of the Vienna Codex reads:

> And the Lord with his own mouth called me [Enoch] and said: Be brave, Youth![81] Do not be frightened! Stand up in front of my face forever. And Michael, the Lord's *archistratig*, brought me in the front of the Lord's face. And the Lord tempted his servants and said to them: «Let Enoch come up and stand in the front of my face forever». And the glorious ones bowed down and said: «Let him come up!»[82]

This veneration of the Youth by the heavenly hosts in the context of God's speech recalls the liturgical accounts found in *Synopse* 390 and *Sefer Haqqomah* where the angelic hosts prostrate themselves before the Youth in the Presence of the deity allowing the exalted angel to insert the fire of deafness into their ears. It is not coincidental that scholars previously pointed to the liturgical coloring of this scene from *2 Enoch* 22 where the patriarch changes his earthly garments for the luminous attire which now closely resembles the priestly vesture.[83]

Conclusion

The liturgical tradition found in *2 Enoch* can be viewed as a bridge that connects the early traditions about the sacerdotal duties of the patriarch found in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* with the later Hekhalot and *Shi*ᶜ*ur Qomah* lore where references to the translated hero's priestly role are juxtaposed with his liturgical performances. Scholars have previously noted that Enoch's figure portrayed in the various sections of *2 Enoch* appears to be more complex than in the early Enochic tractates of *1 Enoch*.[84] For the first time, the Enochic tradition seeks to depict Enoch, not simply as a human taken to heaven and transformed into an angel, but as a celestial being exalted above the angelic world. In this attempt, one may find the origins of another image of Enoch, very different from the early Enochic literature, which was developed much later in Merkabah mysticism — the concept of the supreme angel Metatron, the «Prince of the Presence».[85] The attestation of the seventh antediluvian patriarch as the celestial liturgical director in *2 Enoch* gives additional weight to this hypothesis about the transitional nature of the Slavonic account which

[81] Slav. **юноше.**

[82] MS V (VL 125) [Nr. 3], fol. 317.

[83] Himmelfarb, Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses… 40.

[84] Alexander, From Son of Adam to a Second God… 102–104; Odeberg, 3 Enoch… 52–63.

[85] P. Alexander observes that «the transformation of Enoch in *2 Enoch* 22 provides the closest approximation, outside Merkabah literature, to Enoch's transformation in *3 Enoch* 3–13» (Alexander, 3 Enoch… 248).

guides the old pseudepigraphical traditions into the new mystical dimension. In this respect the tradition found in *2 Enoch* 18 might represent an important step towards defining and shaping Enoch-Metatron's liturgical office in its transition to his new role as the celestial choirmaster.[86] It is also significant that the beginning of Enoch's liturgical functions in *2 Enoch* is conflated there with the development of his new titles-offices as the Youth and the Servant of the Divine Presence which will later play a prominent role in the Merkabah passages pertaining to Metatron's liturgical actions.

ABSTRACT

Enoch-Metatron's liturgical office plays a prominent role in the Merkabah lore, yet this tradition appears to be absent in early Enochic texts, including the compositions collected in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Book of Giants*. Despite this apparent absence, this study argues that the roots of Enoch-Metatron's liturgical imagery can be traced to the Second Temple Enochic lore, namely, to *2 Enoch*, the Jewish apocalypse, apparently written in the first century CE. Some traditions found in this text appear to serve as the initial background for the developments of the future liturgical role of Enoch-Metatron as the celestial choirmaster. Scholars have previously noted that Enoch's figure portrayed in the various sections of *2 Enoch* appears to be more complex than in the early Enochic tractates of *1 Enoch*. For the first time, the Enochic tradition seeks to depict Enoch, not simply as a human taken to heaven and transformed into an angel, but as a celestial being exalted above the angelic world. In this attempt, one may find the origins of another image of Enoch, very different from the early Enochic literature, which was developed much later in Merkabah mysticism — the concept of the supreme angel Metatron, the «Prince of the Presence». The attestation of the seventh antediluvian patriarch as the celestial liturgical director in *2 Enoch* gives additional weight to this hypothesis about the transitionary nature of the Slavonic account which guides the old pseudepigraphical traditions into the new mystical dimension. In this respect the tradition found in *2 Enoch* represents an important step towards defining and shaping Enoch-Metatron's liturgical office in its transition to his new role as the celestial choirmaster. It is also significant that the beginning of Enoch's liturgical functions in *2 Enoch* is conflated there with the development of his new titles-offices as the Youth and the Servant of the Divine Presence which will later play a prominent role in the Merkabah passages pertaining to Metatron's liturgical actions.

[86] It is intriguing that a similar or maybe even competing development can be detected in the early lore about Yahoel. Thus, *Apoc. Abr.* 10:9 depicts Yahoel as the one who is responsible for teaching «those who carry the song through the medium of man's night of the seventh hour» (R. Rubinkiewicz, Apocalypse of Abraham // OTP. Vol. 1. 694). In ch. 12 of the same text Abraham addresses to Yahoel as «Singer of the Eternal One».

Andrei A. Orlov
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

THE FACE AS THE HEAVENLY COUNTERPART OF THE VISIONARY IN THE SLAVONIC *LADDER OF JACOB*

Introduction

The book of Genesis portrays Jacob as someone who not only saw God but also wrestled with Him. Jacob's visionary experiences begin in Genesis 28 where he sees in a dream the ladder on which the angels of God are ascending and descending. Above the ladder Jacob beholds the Lord. The distinct feature of the Bethel account is the paucity of theophanic imagery. Despite the fact that the vision is linked with the celestial realm («ladder's top reaching to heaven»), which is labeled in the story as «the awesome place», «the house of God», and «the gate of heaven», the narrative does not offer any descriptions of God's celestial court or his appearance. Instead we have the audible revelation of God, his lengthy address to Jacob with promises and blessings.

God appears again to Jacob in Genesis 32. While the narrative stresses the importance of the vision of God (the account claims that Jacob «saw God face to face» and even called the place of wrestling Peniel/Penuel — «The Face of God»), it focuses its description on Jacob's *wrestling* with God rather than his *seeing* of God.

The reference to the motif of God's Face (which plays an important role in a number of biblical theophanic accounts)[1] and to Jacob's seeing of God «face to face» could however indicate that the authors or editors of Jacob's account might be cognizant of the broader anthropomorphic theophanic debates in which the motif of God's Face[2] played an important role. In order to

[1] See, e.g., Exod. 33:18–23; Ps. 17:15.

[2] On the Face of God, see S. Balentine, The Hidden God: The Hiding Face of God in the Old Testament (Oxford, 1983) 49–65; A. De Conick, Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First Century Christology in the Second Century // The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism / Ed. C. C. Newman, J. R. Davila, G. S. Lewis (Leiden, 1999) (JSJ, 63) 325–330; W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament. 2 vols (Philadelphia, 1967) Vol. 2. 35–39; M. Fishbane, Form and Reformulation of the Biblical Priestly Blessing // *JAOS* 103 (1983) 115–121; S. Olyan, A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism (Tübingen, 1993) (TSAJ, 36) 105–109; J. Reindl, Das Angesicht Gottes im Sprachgebrauch des Alten Testaments (Leipzig, 1970) (ETS, 25) 236–237;

clarify these theophanic developments, which can shed further light on the background of Jacob's biblical story, the current research must turn to other materials associated with Jacob's traditions where his visionary accounts have a more elaborated form. Such materials include the *Ladder of Jacob*,[3] a Jewish pseudepigraphon, which has survived in its Slavonic translation.

The Slavonic Account of Jacob's Vision

The materials known under the title the *Ladder of Jacob*, have been preserved solely in Slavonic as a part of the so-called *Толковая Палея*[4] (the Explanatory Palaia) where the editors of its various versions reworked[5] and

M. Смтн, «Seeing God» in the Psalms: The Background to the Beatific Vision in the Hebrew Bible // *CBQ* 50 (1988) 171–183.

[3] On the *Ladder of Jacob*, see H. F. Sparks (ed.), The Apocryphal Old Testament (Oxford, 1984) 453–463; N. Bonwetsch, Die Apokryphe «Leiter Jakobs» // *Göttinger Nachrichten, philol.-histor. Klasse* (1900) 76–87; E. Bratke, Das sogenannte Religionsgespräch am Hof der Sasaniden (Leipzig, 1899) (TU, 4.3) 101–106; И. Франко, Апокріфи і легенди з українських рукописів (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]) 5 тт. (Львов, 1896–1910) Т. 1. 108–120; А. И. Яцимирский, Библіографический обзоръ апокрифовъ въ южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки Памятников). Вып. 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные (Петроград, 1921) 38–39; M. R. James, Ladder of Jacob // idem, The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament (London, 1920) (TED, 14) 96–103; J. Kugel, The Ladder of Jacob // *HTR* 88 (1995) 209–227; Н. М. Вторых, Древности. Труды Славянской комиссии Московского археологического общества, 2 (1902) Протокол 1; Г. Кушелев-Безбородко, Памятники старинной русской литературы. 4 тт. (Санкт-Петербург, 1865) Т. 3. 27–32; Палея толковая по списку, сделанному в г. Коломне в 1406 г. / Труд учеников Н. С. Тихонравова (Москва, 1892) 153–166; И. Я. Порфирьев, Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки // Сборник отд. русского языка и словесности 17.1 (Санкт-Петербург, 1877) 138–149; М. А. Салмина, Лествица Иакова // Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.) / Под ред. Д. С. Лихачева (Ленинград, 1987) 230–231; Д. Святский, Лестница Иакова или сон наяву (Санкт-Петербург, 1911) 31–32; Н. С. Тихонравов, Памятники отреченной русской литературы. 2 тт. (Санкт-Петербург, 1863) Т. 1. 91–95; Толковая палея 1477 года (Санкт-Петербург, 1892) (Общество любителей древнерусской письменности, 93) 100a–107b.

[4] On *Толковая Палея*, see В. Адрианова, К литературной истории Толковой Палеи (Киев, 1910); В. М. Истрин, Редакции Толковой Палеи // *ИОРЯС* 10/4 (1905) 150–151; Палея толковая по списку, сделанному в г. Коломне…; Порфирьев, Апокрифические сказания… 11–12; Толковая палея 1477 года…; О. В. Творогов, Палея Толковая // Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси… 285–288; В. М. Успенский, Толковая Палея (Казань, 1876).

[5] Lunt observes that the seventh chapter of the *Ladder* is a later Christian addition juxtaposed to the story by a Slavic (possibly, Russian) editor of *Palaia*; see H. G. Lunt, Ladder of Jacob // OTP. Vol. 2. 401–411 (404–405).

rearranged them. Despite its long life inside the compendium of heterogeneous materials and its long history of transmission in Greek and Slavonic milieux, the pseudepigraphon seems to have preserved several early traditions that can safely be placed within the Jewish environment of the first century CE. Scholars propose that the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob* is most likely derived from its Greek variant, which in turn appears to have been translated from Hebrew or Aramaic.[6] The content of the work is connected with Jacob's dream about the ladder and the interpretation of the vision. In Horace Lunt's translation, the text is divided into seven chapters.[7] The first chapter depicts Jacob's dream in which he sees the ladder and receives God's audible revelation about the promised land and blessings upon his descendants. In the second chapter, a reader encounters Jacob's lengthy prayer to God in which he uncovers additional details of his dream and asks God to help him interpret the dream. In chapter 3, God sends to Jacob the angel Sariel as an interpreter. In chapter 4, Sariel informs Jacob that his name has been changed to Israel. Perceptive readers may thus notice that despite the title of pseudepigraphon, its text is not only confined to the ladder account but also accommodates features of Jacob's other visions, namely, the substitution of his name during the wrestling account. The last three chapters of the *Ladder* recount Sariel's eschatological interpretations of Jacob's dream in which he reveals to the visionary the details of future human history.

The Face as God's Kavod

The imagery of the divine/angelic faces plays a prominent role in the first chapter of *Ladder*. The text describes Jacob's dream in which he sees a twelve step ladder, fixed on the earth, whose top reaches to heaven with the angels ascending and descending on it. This familiar biblical motif then is elaborated further and adds some new features.[8] The story relates that on the ladder

[6] Kugel, The Ladder of Jacob… 209.

[7] In this paper I have used H. Lunt's English translation of *Ladder* and follow his division of chapters and verses; see Lunt, Ladder of Jacob… 401–411. The Slavonic citations are drawn from the following publications of the manuscripts: Recension A — MS S (Sinodal'naja Palaia. Sin. 210) published in Толковая Палея 1477 года… 100a–107b; MS R (Rumjancevskaja Palaia. Rum. 455) published in Кушелев-Безбородко, Памятники старинной русской литературы… T. 2. 27–32; MS F (Krehivskaja Palaia) published in Франко, Апокріфи і легенди… T. 1. 108–120; Recension B — MS K (Kolomenskaja Palaia. Tr.-Serg. 38) published in Тихонравов, Памятники отреченной русской литературы… T. 1. 91–95 and in Палея толковая по списку, сделанному в г. Коломне… 153–166; MS P (Soloveckaja Palaia. Sol. 653) published in Порфирьев, Апокрифические сказания… 138–149.

[8] *Ladder of Jacob* 1.3–10 reads: «And behold, a ladder was fixed on the earth, whose top reaches to heaven. And the top of the ladder was the face as of a man, carved out of fire. There were twelve steps leading to the top of the ladder, and on

Jacob sees twenty-two human faces with their chests, two of them on each step of the ladder. On the top of the ladder, he also beholds another human face «carved out of fire»[9] with its shoulders and arms. In comparison with the previous «faces», this fiery «higher» face looks «exceedingly terrifying». The text portrays God standing above this «highest» face and calling Jacob by his name. The depiction leaves the impression that God's voice[10] is hidden behind this fiery terrifying «face» as a distinct divine manifestation, behind which God conveys to Jacob his audible revelation about the Promised Land and the blessings upon Jacob's descendants.

This description of the celestial «Face» as the fiery anthropomorphic extent,[11] which serves as the embodiment of the deity leads us to another Slavonic text in which the theme of the fiery Face looms large. This text is *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse, the hypothetical date of which (c. first century CE) is in close proximity to the date of *Ladder*. *2 Enoch* 22[12] contains a theophanic depiction of the Face of the Lord, which emits light and fire. The important detail that connects this passage with *Ladder* is that the Face in *2 Enoch* is similarly defined as «fiery»[13] and «terrify-

each step to the top there were two human faces, on the right and on the left, twenty-four faces (or busts) including their chests. And the face in the middle was higher than all that I saw, the one of fire, including the shoulders and arms, exceedingly terrifying, more than those twenty-four faces. And while I was still looking at it, behold, angels of God ascended and descended on it. And God was standing above its highest face, and he called to me from there, saying, "Jacob, Jacob!" And I said, "Here I am, Lord!" And he said to me, "The land on which you are sleeping, to you will I give it, and to your seed after you. And I will multiply your seed..."». Lunt, Ladder of Jacob… 407.

[9] Ibid. 406.

[10] James Charlesworth notes that in the *Ladder,* as «in some of other pseudepigrapha, the voice has ceased to be something heard and has become a hypostatic creature». See Charlesworth's comment in Lunt, Ladder of Jacob… 406.

[11] I use the term «extent» since the *Ladder* specifically mentions shoulders and arms in its description of the Face.

[12] *2 En.* 22.1–4 (the longer recension): «I saw the view of the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot in a fire and brought out, and it emits sparks and is incandescent. Thus even I saw the face of the Lord. But the face of the Lord is not to be talked about, it is so very marvelous and supremely awesome and supremely frightening. And who am I to give an account of the incomprehensible being of the Lord, and of his face, so extremely strange and indescribable? And how many are his commands, and his multiple voice, and the Lord's throne, supremely great and not made by hands, and the choir stalls all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, and their never-silent singing. Who can give an account of his beautiful appearance, never changing and indescribable, and his great glory? And I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord». F. Andersen, 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 136.

[13] F. Andersen in his commentary on *2 En.* 22 notes the similarities between the fiery face in *2 Enoch* and the face of fire in *Ladder*. Cf. Andersen, 2 Enoch… 137, n. 22d.

ing».[14] Another parallel is that in both *2 Enoch* and *Ladder* the Face is understood as the luminous representation of the deity, behind which He can convey His audible revelation to visionaries.[15]

It is noteworthy that the incandescent Face in *2 Enoch*, as well as in *Ladder*, is depicted not as a part of an angelic or divine «body» but rather as the fiery «forefront» of the whole anthropomorphic extent.[16]

It has been previously noted[17] that this fiery extent, labeled in some biblical and intertestamental texts as the «Face», is related to the glorious celestial entity known in theophanic traditions as God's *Kavod*.[18] In these traditions, the Face often serves to designate the radiant *façade* of the divine *Kavod*.[19] This tendency to equate the Face with the *Kavod* can be found already in some biblical accounts, including Exod. 33:18–23, where in response to Moses' plea to God to show him his *glory*, God answers that it is impossible for a human being to see God's face.[20]

[14] Both Slavonic pseudepigraphons in their description of the Face share the similar Slavonic terminology, words like face (**лицє**); fiery (**огнена**, **изъ огнѧ**); terrifying (**страшно**). Cf. Франко, Апокріфи і легенди… Т. 1. 109; Кушелев-Безбородко, Памятники старинной русской литературы… Т. 3. 27; Порфирьев, Апокрифические сказания… 138; Тихонравов, Памятники отреченной русской литературы… Т. 1. 91; Толковая палея 1477 года… 100b; A. Vaillant, Le Livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française (Paris, 1976 [1952]) (Textes publiés par l'Institut d'études slaves, 4) 24 and 38.

[15] See A. De Conick, Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas (Leiden, 1996) (SVC, 33) 104–105.

[16] It is notable that although the *Ladder* uses the Slavonic term *lice* («face») in its depiction of the «Face», the text mentions that the face Jacob sees has also shoulders and arms.

[17] A. Orlov, Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition // Society of Biblical Literature 2000 Seminar Papers (Atlanta, 2000) (SBLSP, 39) 130–147.

[18] The early traces of this tendency to identify *Kavod* with the Face within Enochic tradition can be seen already in the *Book of the Watchers* 14 where the enthroned Glory is labeled the *Face*. Cf. *1 En.* 14:21: «And no angel could enter, and at the appearance of the face (*gaṣṣ*) of him who is honored and praised no (creature of) flesh could look» (M. A. Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments. 2 vols (Oxford, 1978) Vol. 2. 99).

[19] It is noteworthy, that already in the classic Ezekilean description of God's Glory in Ezek. 1:27, *Kavod* is described similarly to the description of the Face in *Ladder*, namely, as the fiery *bust*: «I saw that from what appeared to be his *waist up* he looked like glowing metal, as it full of fire, and that from there down he looked like fire; and brilliant light surrounded him».

[20] See Exod. 33:18–23: «Then Moses said, "Now show me your glory (כבדך)". And the Lord said, "I will cause all my goodness to pass in front of you, and I will proclaim my name, the Lord, in your presence... but", he said, "you cannot see my face (פני), for no one may see me and live"».

The second chapter of the *Ladder*, in which the visionary asks God to interpret the dream, provides several additional important details about the dream that explicitly identify the fiery Face with God's *Kavod*.

In the second chapter of the Slavonic text, Jacob offers a prayer in which he discloses further details of his vision of the Face. *Ladder* 2:7–19 reads:

> Lord God of Adam your creature and Lord God of Abraham and Isaac my fathers and of all who have walked before you in justice! You who sit firmly on the cherubim and the fiery throne of glory... and the many-eyed (ones) just I saw in my dream, holding the four-faced cherubim, bearing also the many-eyed seraphim, carrying the whole world under your arm, yet not being borne by anyone; you who have made the skies firm for the glory of your name, stretching out on two heavenly clouds the heaven which gleams under you, that beneath it you may cause the sun to course and conceal it during the night so that it might not seem a god; (you) who made on them a way for the moon and the stars; and you make the moon wax and wane, and destine the stars to pass on so that they too might not seem gods. Before the face of your glory the six-winged seraphim are afraid, and they cover their feet and faces with their wings, while flying with their other (wings), and they sing unceasingly a hymn: ...whom I now in sanctifying a new (song)... Twelve-topped, twelve-faced, many-named, fiery one! Lightning-eyed holy one! Holy, Holy, Holy, Yao, Yaova, Yaoil, Yao, Kados, Chavod, Savaoth...[21]

Several details are important in this description. Jacob's prayer reveals that his dream about the Face might represent the vision of the Throne of God's Glory. A number of points need to be noted to support this conclusion:

a. The prayer refers to «his many-eyed ones»,[22] alluding to האופנים, the Wheels, the special class of the Angels of the Throne who are described in Ezek. 1:18 as the angelic beings «full of eyes».

b. The text describes the deity as seated on the fiery Throne of Glory.

c. The vision contains references to the angelic liturgy and the *Trisagion*.

d. The text refers to the fear of the angelic hosts, who stand in the front of the terrifying fiery «Face» and try to protect themselves with their wings («before the face of your glory the six-winged seraphim are afraid, and they cover their feet and faces with their wings»). The motif of protection against the harmful brilliance of God's Throne is typical to theophanic descriptions of *Kavod* from the earliest accounts found in Isa. 6:1–4 to the latest accounts found in *3 Enoch*, which relate that «...in ʿArabot there are 660 thousands of myriads of glorious angels, hewn out of flaming fire, standing opposite the throne of glory. The glorious King covers his face,

[21] Lunt, Ladder of Jacob... 408.

[22] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 137.

otherwise the heaven of ʿArabot would burst open in the middle, because of the glorious brilliance».[23]

e. The passage also contains a specific terminology associated with the Throne imagery. It has been mentioned earlier that the Slavonic text of the *Ladder* is possibly based on the Semitic original. *Ladder of Jacob* 2.18 contains a non-Slavonic word *Chavod*[24] which the translator (H. Lunt) defines as the transliterated Hebrew term *Kavod*.[25]

f. Finally, the passage explicitly identifies the fiery Face with God's glory. *Ladder of Jacob* 2:15 says that «before the face of your glory the six-winged seraphim are afraid…». Thus the fiery face in *Ladder* 1:6 is not just any face but the Face of God.

The apparent similarities between two Slavonic accounts indicate that *Ladder*, as well as *2 Enoch*, seem to represent a single tradition in which the fiery Face is associated with *Kavod*.

Additional evidence to support the view that the fiery Face on the ladder in *Ladder* represents God's *Kavod* can be found in the targumic accounts of Jacob's story. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* and *Targum Onqelos* give numerous references to the Glory of the Lord in their description of Jacob's vision of the ladder.

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to Gen. 28:13–17 reads:

> And, behold, the Glory of the Lord (יקרא דה) stood beside him and said to him, «I am the Lord, the God of your father Abraham and the God of Isaac. The land on which you are lying I will give to you and to your children» ... And Jacob awoke from his sleep and said, «In truth the Glory of the Shekinah (יקר שכינתא) of the Lord dwells in this place, and I did not know it». He was afraid and said, «How awesome and glorious is this place! This is not a profane place, but a sanctuary to the name of the Lord; and this is (a place) suitable for prayer, corresponding to the gate of heaven, founded beneath the Throne of Glory (בורסי יקרא)».[26]

Targum Onqelos[27] to Gen. 28:13–16 also reflects the same tradition, which depicts Jacob's encounter as the vision of the Divine Glory. In both targumic

[23] P. Alexander, 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 223–315 (305).

[24] MS *S* — *Chavod*; MS *R* — *Chavod*; MS *F* — *Chsavod*. See Толковая палея 1477 года… 101b; Кушелев-Безбородко, Памятники старинной русской литературы… T. 1. 110.

[25] See Lunt, Ladder of Jacob… 408, n. 2.i.

[26] Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis / Trans. M. Maher (Collegeville, MN, 1992) (AB, 1B) 99–100; Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia. IV. Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum. 5 vols / Ed. A. Díez Macho (Matriti, 1977) Vol. 1. 195–197.

[27] «...and here, The Glory of the Lord (יקרא דיי) was standing over him, and He said, "I am the Lord, the God of your Father Abraham and the God of Isaac: the land

accounts, the Glory of the Lord seems topologically located in the place which in *Ladder* is occupied by the Face.

The Face as Jacob's Heavenly Counterpart

Scholars have previously noted that in *Ladder* the fiery Face not only embodies God's Glory but also seems to represent the heavenly counterpart of Jacob.[28] They observe that the bust of fire, labeled in *Ladder* as the Face, can be associated with the heavenly «image» of Jacob engraved on the Throne of Glory.[29] The traditions about the heavenly «image» of Jacob are present in several targumic[30] texts,[31] including *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, Targum Neofiti*,[32] and the *Fragmentary Targum*.[33]

---

on which you sleep I will give to you and to your offspring...". The Jacob awoke from his sleep and said, "Truly the Glory of the Lord (יקרא דיי) dwells in this place, and I did not know it"» (The Targum Onqelos to Genesis / Trans. B. Grossfeld (Wilmington, DE, 1988) (Aramaic Bible, 6) 104; M. Aberbach, B. Grossfeld [eds.], Targum Onkelos to Genesis: A Critical Analysis Together with an English Translation of the Text (New York, 1982) 171).

[28] J. Fossum, The Image of the Invisible God (Freiburg—Göttingen, 1995) (NTOA, 30) 135–151 (143).

[29] «...[in the *Ladder*] in the fiery bust of the terrifying man we are probably correct to see the heavenly 'image' of Jacob» (Fossum, The Image of the Invisible God... 143, n. 30).

[30] The same tradition can be found in rabbinic texts. *Gen. R.* 68:12 reads: «...thus it says, Israel in whom I will be glorified (Isa. xlix, 3); it is thou, [said the angels,] whose features are engraved on high; they ascended on high and saw his features and they descended below and found him sleeping». (Midrash Rabbah. 10 vols. (London, 1961) Vol. 2. 626). On Jacob's image on the Throne of Glory, see also *Gen. R.* 78:3; 82:2; *Num. R.* 4:1; *b.* Hul. 91b; *PRE*. 35.

[31] On the traditions about Jacob's image engraved on the Throne see E. R. Wolfson, Along the Path: Studies in Kabbalistic Myth, Symbolism, and Hermeneutics (Albany, NY, 1995) 1–62, 111–186.

[32] «And he dreamed, and behold, a ladder was fixed on the earth and its head reached to the height of the heavens; and behold, the angels that had accompanied him from the house of his father ascended to bear good tidings to the angels on high, saying: «Come and see the pious man whose image is engraved in the throne of Glory, whom you desired to see». And behold, the angels from before the Lord ascended and descended and observed him» (Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis / Trans. M. McNamara (Collegeville, MN, 1992) (Aramaic Bible, 1A) 140).

[33] «...And he dreamt that there was a ladder set on the ground, whose top reached towards the heavens; and behold the angels that had accompanied him from his father's house ascended to announce to the angels of the heights: "Come and see the pious man, whose image is fixed to the throne of glory..."». (M. L. Klein, The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to Their Extant Sources. 2 vols. (Rome, 1980) (AB, 76) Vol. 1. 57; Vol. 2. 20).

In *Targ. Ps.-J.* to Gen 28.12 the following description can be found:

> He [Jacob] had a dream, and behold, a ladder was fixed in the earth with its top reaching toward the heavens ... and on that day they (angels) ascended to the heavens on high, and said, Come and see Jacob the pious, whose image is fixed (engraved) in the Throne of Glory (דאיקונין דיליה קביעא בכורסי יקרא), and whom you have desired to see.[34]

A distinctive feature of this description is that the heavenly counterpart of Jacob, his «image», is engraved on a very special celestial entity, on the *Throne of Glory*. Engraving on the Throne might indicate an association with the *Kavod* since the Throne is the central part of the *Kavod* imagery — the seat of the anthropomorphic Glory of the Lord. The image engraved on the Throne might be an allusion to the face,[35] the fiery face, since it is engraved on the fiery and glorious Throne of the Glory.

Besides the tradition of «engraving» on the Throne, some Jewish materials point to an even more radical identification of Jacob's image with *Kavod*. Jarl Fossum's research[36] demonstrates that in some traditions about Jacob's image, his «image» or «likeness» is depicted not simply as *engraved* on the heavenly Throne, but as *seated* upon the Throne of Glory.[37] Fossum argues that this second tradition is original. Christopher Rowland proposed that Jacob's image is «identical with the form of God on the throne of glory (Ezek. 1:26f.)».[38] J. Fossum offers additional support for this idea by pointing out that the Hebrew forms of the Greek loan word εἰκών, used in the Targums and *Gen. R.* 68.12, are synonymous with צלם and דמות.[39] He further suggests that «איקונין or דיוקנא can thus be seen to denote a bodily form, even that of God, that is the Divine Glory».[40]

The hypothesis about the identification of Jacob's image and the Divine Glory returns us again to the imagery of God's *Kavod* with which, as has been shown earlier, the Face in *Ladder* and *2 Enoch* is closely associated.

---

[34] Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis… 99–100; Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia. IV. Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum… Vol. 1. 195.

[35] *Hekhalot Rabbati* (*Synopse* § 164) attests to the tradition of Jacob's face engraved on the throne of glory: לקלסתר פניו יעקב אביהם שהיא חקוקה לי על כסא כבודי; see P. Schäfer, with M. Schlüter and H. G. von Mutius, Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur (Tübingen, 1981) (TSAJ, 2) 72.

[36] Fossum, The Image of the Invisible God… 140–141.

[37] Fossum notes that this tradition is already observable in some versions of the *Fragmentary Targum* which do not contain the verb «engraved» or «fixed» (Fossum, The Image of the Invisible God… 141). He also points to a certain baraita (*b.* Hul. 91b) that seems to attests to the same tradition (139–140).

[38] C. Rowland, John 1:51, Jewish Apocalyptic and Targumic Tradition // *NTS* 30 (1984) 498–507 (504).

[39] Fossum, The Image of the Invisible God… 142.

[40] Ibid.

Enochic materials may also correlate the Face of God (divine *Kavod*) with the heavenly counterpart of the visionary. In *2 Enoch*, the Face of the Lord seems to play an important role in the description of Enoch's heavenly counterpart. *2 Enoch* 39:3–6 depicts the patriarch who, during his short trip to the earth, retells to his children his earlier encounter with the Face. Enoch relates:

> You, my children, you see my face, a human being created just like yourselves; I am one who has seen the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot by a fire, emitting sparks. For you gaze into my eyes, a human being created just like yourselves; but I have gazed into the eyes of the Lord, like the rays of the shining sun and terrifying the eyes of a human being. You, my children, you see my right hand beckoning you, a human being created identical to yourselves; but I have seen the right hand of the Lord, beckoning me, who fills heaven. You see the extent of my body, the same as your own; but I have seen the extent of the Lord, without measure and without analogy, who has no end.[41]

Enoch's description provides a series of analogies in which the earthly Enoch compares his face and parts of his body with the attributes of the Lord's Face and body. For this investigation, however, another juxtaposition is most pertinent. It is a contrast between the two identities of the visionary: the earthly Enoch («a human being created just like yourselves») and his heavenly counterpart («the one who has seen the Face of God»). It appears that Enoch tries to describe himself in two different modes of existence: as a human being who now stands before his children with a human face and body and as the one who has seen God's Face in the celestial realm. These descriptions of two conditions (earthly and celestial) occur repeatedly in tandem. It is possible that the purpose of Enoch's instruction to his children is not to stress the difference between his human body and the Lord's body, but to emphasize the distinction between *this* Enoch, a human being «created just like yourselves», and the *other* angelic Enoch who has been standing before the Lord's face. Enoch's previous transformation into the glorious one and his initiation into *Sar ha-Panim* in *2 En.* 22.7 support this suggestion. It is unlikely that Enoch somehow completely abandoned his supra-angelic status and his unique place before the Face of the Lord granted to him in the previous chapters. An account of Enoch's permanent installation can be found in chapter 36 where the Lord tells Enoch, before his short visit to the earth, that a place has been prepared for him and that he will be in the front of Lord's face «from *now* and forever».[42] Finally, in chapter 43,[43] Enoch introduces himself to his children

[41] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 163.

[42] *2 Enoch* 36:3. Andersen, 2 Enoch… 161.

[43] A similar testimony can also be found in the passage of *2 Enoch* preserved in the Slavonic collection of ethical writings, «The Just Balance» (*Мерило Праведное*),

as the Governor[44] of the World.[45] This title gives additional proof for the fact that the permanent installation of Enoch-Metatron in the heavenly offices, including the office of the Prince of the World (שר העולם), has already taken place. The importance of this account for the idea of the heavenly counterpart in *2 Enoch* is apparent because it points to the simultaneous existence of Enoch's angelic double installed in heaven and its human counterpart, whom God sends periodically on missionary errands. Targumic and rabbinic Jacob accounts also attest to this view of the heavenly counterpart when they depict angels beholding Jacob as one who at one and the same time is installed in heaven and is sleeping on earth.[46]

The idea about the heavenly counterpart of the visionary found in *2 Enoch* is also present in another early Enochic account. One of the booklets of *1 (Ethiopic) Enoch* attests a similar tradition. Scholars have previously observed[47] that the *Similitudes* seem to entertain the idea of the heavenly twin of a visionary when it identifies Enoch with the Son of Man.[48] For a long time, students of the Enochic traditions were puzzled by the fact that the Son of Man, who in previous chapters of the *Similitudes* has been distinguished from Enoch, becomes suddenly identified in *1 Enoch* 71 with the patriarch. James VanderKam suggests that this puzzle can be explained by the Jewish

in which the existence of *2 Enoch* was first made public. Cf. М. Н. Тихомиров, Мерило Праведное по рукописи XIV века (Москва, 1961).

[44] Andersen translates the title as «the manager of the arrangements on earth», see Andersen, 2 Enoch… 217.

[45] On this title of Enoch and its connection with the office of the Prince of the World, see A. Orlov, Titles of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch // *JSP* 18 (1998) 82–85.

[46] *Targ. Neof.* to Gen 28:12: «...and behold, the angels from before the Lord ascended and descended and observed him [Jacob]» (Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis… 140); *Gen. R.* 68.12: «...they ascended on high and saw his features and they descended below and found him sleeping» (Midrash Rabbah… Vol. 2. 626).

[47] See J. VanderKam, Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71 // The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins / Ed. J. H. Charlesworth *et al.* (Minneapolis, 1992) 161–191 (182–183); M. A. Knibb, Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls // *DSD* 2 (1995) 177–180; Fossum, The Image of the Invisible God… 144–145; C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology (Tübingen, 1997) (WUNT, 2/94) 151.

[48] It is important to note that in the *Similitudes,* the Son of Man is depicted as seated on the Throne of Glory. See *1 En.* 62:5; 69:29. Fossum observes that «in the "Similitudes" the "Elect One" or "Son of Man" who identified as the patriarch Enoch, is enthroned upon the "throne of glory". If "glory" does not qualify the throne but its occupant, Enoch is actually identified with the Glory of God». Fossum further concludes that «...the "Similitudes of Enoch" present an early parallel to the targumic description of Jacob being seated upon the "throne of glory"» (Fossum, The Image of the Invisible God… 145).

notion, attested in several ancient Jewish texts, that a creature of flesh and blood could have a heavenly double or counterpart.[49] To provide an example, VanderKam points to Jacob's traditions in which the patriarch's «features are engraved on high».[50] He stresses that this theme of the visionary's ignorance of his higher angelic identity is observable, for example, in the *Prayer of Joseph*.

It is noteworthy that in the *Similitudes*, similarly in *2 Enoch* and *Ladder*,[51] the theme of the heavenly counterpart seems to conflate with the imagery of God's *Kavod*. *1 Enoch* 71:5 reports that Enoch is brought by Michael to the fiery structure, surrounded by the rivers of living fire, which he describes as «a something built of crystal stones, and in the middle of those stones tongues of living fire».[52]

There is no doubt that the fiery «structure» in the *Similitudes* represents the Throne of Glory, which, in another booklet of *1 Enoch*, is also described as the crystal structure issuing streams of fire.[53] An explicit reference to the Throne of Glory in *1 En.* 71:8,[54] immediately after the description of the fiery «crystal» structure, makes this clear.

Similarities between *1 Enoch* 71 and *2 Enoch* 22 in the depictions of *Kavod* and Enoch's transformation near the Throne of Glory are also apparent.

a. In both accounts (*1 En.* 71:3–5 and *2 En.* 22:6), Enoch is brought to the Throne by archangel Michael.

b. Angelology of the Throne in *1 Enoch*, as in *2 Enoch* and *Ladder*,[55] includes three classes of angelic beings: ophanim, cherubim and seraphim.

---

[49] VanderKam, Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man… 182–183.

[50] Ibid.

[51] A notable detail in the description is that during his ascension Enoch, in a manner similar to Jacob's vision of the ladder, sees the angelic «movements» and the angelic «faces». In *1 En.* 71:1 he reports about «...the sons of the holy angels treading upon flames of fire, and their garments (were) white, and their clothing, and the light of their face (was) like snow» (Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 2. 165).

[52] Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 2. 166.

[53] In the *Book of the Watchers* 14:18–19 the Throne of Glory is also described as a crystal structure surrounded of the rivers of fire. The reference to «crystal» structure also recalls the depiction of the Throne in Ezek. 1.26, where it is described as a throne of sapphire (ספיר).

[54] *1 En.* 71:7: «And round about (were) the Seraphim, and the Cherubim, and the Ophannim; these are they who do not sleep, but keep watch over the throne of his glory» (Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 2. 166).

[55] The *Ladder* also refers to three classes of angels, ophanim (many-eyed ones), cherubim and seraphim, right after the remark about the Throne: «...the fiery Throne of Glory ... and the many-eyed (ones) just I saw in my dream, holding the four-faced cherubim, bearing also the many-eyed seraphim» (Lunt, Ladder of Jacob… 408).

c. Both Enochic accounts speak about the transformation of the visionary. Enoch's metamorphosis in *1 Enoch* 71 recalls the description of the luminous transformation of Enoch into a glorious heavenly being from *2 En.* 22:8–9.

d. In both cases, the transformation takes place in front of the fiery «structure», a possible source of both transformations.

e. Studies in the past have noted that in both accounts the transformation of the visionary takes place in the context of the angelic liturgy (*2 En.* 21:1–22.10; *1 En.* 71:11–12).[56] The same feature is also observable in *Ladder* 2.15–18.

f. In both accounts Enoch falls on his face before the Throne.[57]

g. The manner in which Enoch is greeted near the Throne of Glory in *1 En.* 71:14–17 evokes the scene from *2 En.* 22:5–6, where the Lord personally greets Enoch. In both accounts we have an address in which the visionary is informed about his «eternal» status. [58]

These features of both Enochic accounts, entertaining the idea of the heavenly twin, point to the importance of the vision of the *Kavod* in the process of acquiring knowledge about the heavenly counterparts of the visionaries. It is not coincidental that in Jacob's tradition, which also attests the idea of the heavenly counterpart, the vision of God's glory also becomes an important theophanic motif. It is clearly recognizable in the targumic Jacob's accounts and the *Ladder*, where reports about Jacob's angelic counterpart are creatively conflated with theophanic traditions about the vision of God's *Kavod.*

Uriel-Sariel-Phanuel

Another prominent trait that links Jacob's account in the *Ladder* with both above mentioned Enochic accounts (*1 En.* 71 and *2 En.* 22) is the reference to the angel Sariel, also known in various traditions under the names of Phanuel and Uriel.[59]

---

[56] Fletcher-Louis, Luke-Acts… 154.

[57] *1 En.* 71:11: «And I fell upon my face» (Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 2. 166); *2 En.* 21:2 : «I fell on my face» (Andersen, 2 Enoch… 135).

[58] *1 En.* 71:14–15: «You are the Son of Man who was born to righteousness, and righteousness remains over you... and so you will have it for ever and for ever and ever» (Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 2. 166–167); *2 En.* 22:5–6: «Be brave, Enoch! Don't be frightened! Stand up, and stand in front of my face *forever*» (Andersen, 2 Enoch… 138–139).

[59] J. Smith observes that in five instances in *1 Enoch* (40:9; 54:6; 71:8, 9, 13) confined to the *Similitudes*, Phanuel replaces Uriel in a catalog of the four archangels. He also points out that while Sariel is a relatively unknown angelic figure, his

In *2 Enoch* 22–23, Uriel[60] plays an important role during Enoch's initiations near the Throne of Glory.[61] He instructs Enoch about various subjects of esoteric knowledge in order to prepare him for various celestial offices, including the office of the Heavenly Scribe.

1 Enoch 71 also refers to the same angel and names him Phanuel. In the *Similitudes*, he occupies an important place among the four principal angels, namely, the place usually assigned to Uriel. In fact, the angelic name «Phanuel» might be a title which stresses the celestial status of Uriel/Sariel[62] as one of the servants of the divine *Panim*.[63]

The title «Phanuel» is reminiscent of the terminology found in various Jacob's accounts. In Gen. 32:31, Jacob names the place (המקום) of his wrestling with God as Peniel (פניאל) — the Face of God.[64] Scholars be-

---

name seems to be quite frequently conflated with Uriel, as in *1 En.* 9:1. Cf. J. Z. Smith, Prayer of Joseph // OTP. Vol. 2. 699–714 (708–709). For the discussion about Uriel/Sariel/Phanuel, see J. Greenfield, Prolegomenon // H. Odeberg, 3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch (New York, 1973 [Cambridge, 1928]) xxxiv–xxxv; Lunt, The Ladder of Jacob… 405, n. 10; J. Milik, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4 (Oxford, 1976) 170–174; Olyan, A Thousand Thousands Served Him… 105–109; J. Z. Smith, The Prayer of Joseph // Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough / Ed. J. Neusner (Leiden, 1968) (SHR, 14) 270 and 227; G. Vermes, The Archangel Sariel: A Targumic Parallel to the Dead Sea Scrolls // Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults / Ed. J. Neusner (Leiden, 1975) (SJLA, 12.3) 159–166; G. Vermes, The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies during the Last Twenty-Five Years // *JJS* 26 (1975) 1–14 (13).

[60] Slav. **Вѣревеилъ** (Vereveil).

[61] The beginning of this tradition can be found in the *Book of Heavenly Luminaries* (*1 En.* 74:2) where Enoch writes the instructions of the angel Uriel regarding the secrets of heavenly bodies and their movements. See Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 2. 173.

[62] Vermes observes that at Qumran, «Sariel becomes one of the four chief angels, replacing Uriel, the traditional fourth archangel in the Greek Enoch and midrashic literature ... He also appears in an Aramaic fragment of 4Q Enoch 9.1» (Vermes, The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies… 13).

[63] *Hekhalot Rabbati* (*Synopse* § 108) refers to the angel Suria/Suriel as the Prince of the Face: סוריא/סוריאל שר הפנים. Cf. Schäfer, Schlüter, von Mutius, Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur… 52. On the identification of Sariel with the Prince of the Presence, see Odeberg, 3 Enoch… 99–100; Smith, Prayer of Joseph… 709.

[64] The connection between the terms God's Face (פניאל) and the Place (המקום) in Gen. 32:31 is important. In later theophanic contexts the term המקום is closely associated with the *Kavod* imagery. This tradition can be found, for example, in *3 En.* 45:1; 47:1; 48D:8. *3 Enoch* also uses an expression «the Curtain (*pargod*) of the Place» in reference to the celestial veil, which shields the angelic hosts from the harmful luminescence of the *Kavod*.

lieve that the angelic name *Phanuel* and the place *Peniel* are etymologically connected.[65]

Although the *Ladder*'s narrative does not directly refer to the angel named Phanuel, it uses another of his names, Sariel, in reference to the angelic being, who interprets Jacob's dream and announces to him his new angelic status, depicted symbolically in the changing of the patriarch's name to Israel. The *Ladder of Jacob* 2 portrays Jacob asking God in prayer for help in interpreting the dream. Chapter 3 of the *Ladder* relates that God responds to Jacob's prayer by commanding: «Sariel, leader of those who comfort, you who in charge of dreams, go and make Jacob understand the meaning of the dream». The text further depicts the angelophany of Sariel who comes to the patriarch to inform him about his new angelic name and status.

This reference to Sariel/Uriel as the angel who instructs/wrestles with Jacob and announces to him his new angelic name is documented in several other sources, including *Targum Neofiti* and the *Prayer of Joseph*. In the *Prayer of Joseph*, Jacob attests that «Uriel, the angel of God, came forth and said that "I [Jacob-Israel] had descended to earth and I had tabernacled among men and that I had been called by the name of Jacob". He envied me and fought with me and wrestled with me...».[66]

In targumic and rabbinic accounts, Sariel/Uriel is also depicted as the angel who wrestled with Jacob and announced him his new angelic name.

Targum Neofiti to Gen. 32.25–31 reads:

> And Jacob was left alone; and the angel Sariel (שריאל) wrestled with him in the appearance of a man and he embraced him until the time the dawn arose. When he saw that he could not prevail against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh and the hollow of Jacob's thigh became benumbed in his wrestling with him. And he said: «Let me go because the rise of the dawn has arrived, and because the time of the angels on high to praise has arrived, and I am a chief of those who praise» (ואנא ריש למשבחיא). And he said: «I will not let you go unless you bless me». And he said to him: «What is your name?» And he said: «Jacob». And he said: «Your name shall no longer be called Jacob but Israel, because you have claimed

[65] G. Vermes suggests that the angelic name Phanuel «is depended on the Peniel/Penuel of Genesis 32». Cf. Vermes, The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies… 13. Smith supports Vermes' position. In his opinion, «it is most likely that the name Phanuel is to be derived from the place name Peniel/Penuel (the face of God) in Genesis 32:30, and therefore may be related to the title "a man seeing God"» (Smith, Prayer of Joseph… 709). See also S. Olyan, who argues that «the angel Penuel was either derived from texts such Exod. 13:14–15 and Deut. 4:37, where the divine presence is given figurative treatment, or it emerged from the exegesis of Gen. 32:25–33» (Olyan, A Thousand Thousands Served Him… 108–109).

[66] Smith, Prayer of Joseph… 713.

> superiority with angels from before the Lord and with men and you have prevailed against them. And Jacob asked and said: «Tell me your name I pray»; and he said: «Why, now, do you ask my name?» And he blessed him there. And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel (פניאל) because: «I have seen angels from before the Lord face to face and my life has been spared».[67]

Scholars have previously noted that «in the circles represented by the Similitudes of Enoch, Qumran and Neofiti variety of the Palestinian Targum, the angelic adversary of Jacob was recognized as one of the four celestial princes and called alternatively Sariel or Phanuel».[68] It appears that the *Ladder* also belongs to the same circles. In *Targ. Neof.* and *Frag. Targ.*[69] to Gen 32:27, Sariel is defined as «the chief of those who give praise» (ר ישׁ לְמשבחיא). The *Ladder* seems to allude to this title. In the *Ladder* 3:2 Sariel is described as «*stareishino uslazhdaemych*»[70] which can be translated as «the chief of those who give joy».[71]

It is of interest to note that in the *Ladder*, Sariel/Phanuel imagery seems to be influenced by the Enochic tradition even more extensively than in the Targums; in the *Ladder*, the motif of wrestling is completely absent and is replaced by the depiction of Sariel as the interpreter of dreams. It seems that Sariel/Uriel in the *Ladder* assumes the traditional «Enochic» functions of *angelus interpres*.[72]

Princes of the Face

In the *Ladder* and the *Prayer of Joseph*, Jacob's identification with his heavenly counterpart, the angel Israel, involves the initiatory encounter with the angel Sariel/Uriel, who in other texts is also known as Phanuel, the angel of the Divine Presence or the Face. The same state of events is observable in

---

[67] Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis… 158; A. Díez Macho, Neophyti 1, Targum Palistinense Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana. 6 vols (Madrid—Barcelona, 1968) (Textos y Estudios, 7) Vol. 1. 217–219.

[68] Vermes, The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies… 13; Smith, Prayer of Joseph… 709.

[69] Klein, The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch… Vol. 1. 59; Vol. 2. 22.

[70] Slav. **Старѣишино оуслаждаемыхъ.** MSS *S, R, F*. Cf. Толковая палея 1477 года… 101b; Кушелев-Безбородко, Памятники старинной русской литературы… Т. 3. 28; Франко, Апокріфи і легенди… Т. 1. 110.

[71] Slavonic **оуслаждаемыхъ** (*uslazhdaemych*) can be literally translated as «sweetened». Cf. Старославянский словарь по рукописям X–XI веков / Ред. Р. М. Цейтлин (Москва, 1994) 477; И. И. Срезневский, Словарь древнерусского языка. 3 тт. (Москва, 1989) Т. 3. 1266.

[72] On Uriel as an *angelus interpres*, see C. A. Gieschen, Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence (Leiden, 1998) (AGJU, 42) 60.

Enochic materials where Uriel serves as a principal heavenly guide to another prominent visionary who has also acquired knowledge about his own heavenly counterpart, namely, Enoch/Metatron. In both traditions, Uriel/Sariel/Phanuel appears as the guide who assists the visionaries in acquiring or identifying with their new celestial identities.

The process of establishing twinship with the heavenly counterpart might be reflected in the initiatory procedure of becoming a *Sar ha-Panim*, one of the angelic[73] Princes of the Divine Face or Presence, the prominent celestial office, which is often described in detail in various apocalyptic and Merkabah accounts. The installation of a visionary as *Sar ha-Panim* seems to correlate with the procedure of identifying a visionary with his heavenly counterpart.[74] In *1 Enoch* 71, Enoch is transformed and identified with the Son of Man in front of God's Throne. In *2 En.* 22:6–10, Enoch's initiation into one of the Princes of Presence[75] also takes place in front of the fiery Face of the Lord. This encounter transforms Enoch into a glorious being. It is important to note that after this procedure Enoch observes that he had *become like one of the glorious ones*, and *there was no observable difference*.[76] The last phrase describes Enoch's transition to his new identity as «one of the glorious ones». This identity might refer to his angelic counterpart. It also indicates that Enoch's earthly appearance/face has been radically altered and that the visionary has now acquired a new «face» which «mirrors» or «doubles» the Face of the Lord.[77] The motif of engraving the image of the visionary on the Throne

[73] For a complete discussion about angels as the heavenly counterparts of humans, see De Conick, Seek to See Him… 148–157.

[74] The reference to the angels of the Presence as the heavenly counterparts of humans is not confined solely to the Jewish pseudepigrapha. April De Conick's research refers to several important Christian passages in which angels of the Presence/the Face serve as heavenly counterparts of humans; see De Conick, Seek to See Him… 153–154. One of such traditions is reflected in Mt.18:10: «See that you do not despise one of these little ones; for I tell you that in heaven their angels always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven».

[75] On Enoch's role as the Prince of the Presence in *2 Enoch*, see Orlov, Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*… 74–75.

[76] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 139.

[77] A visionary, therefore, becomes a reflection or even a «representation» of the Face/*Kavod*, a sort of its vice-regent. Christopher Morray-Jones observes that «there is evidence, then, of the early existence of a tradition concerning the ascent to heaven of an exceptionally righteous man who beholds the vision of the divine *Kabod* upon Merkabah, is transformed into an angelic being and enthroned as celestial vice-regent, thereby becoming identified with the Name-bearing angel who either is or is closely associated with the *Kabod* itself and functions as a second, intermediary power in heaven» (C. R. A. Morray-Jones, Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition // *JJS* 43 (1992) 10–11).

might also serve as a metaphor for the similarity between the visionary's face and the Face. There is no doubt that one of the features which unifies both «faces» is their luminosity.

2 Enoch's narrative gives evidence that Enoch's face acquired the same qualities of luminosity as the Face of the Lord. In *2 Enoch* 37, the Lord calls one of his angels to chill the face of Enoch before his return to earth. The angel, who «appeared frigid», then chilled Enoch's face with his icy hands. Immediately after this procedure, the Lord tells Enoch that if his face had not been chilled in such a way, no human being would be able to look at his face. This chilling procedure indicates that Enoch's metamorphosis near the Face into the *Sar ha-Panim* involves the transformation of the visionary's face into the fiery, perilous entity which now resembles *Kavod*. We can find a detailed description of this process in another «Enochic» text, *Sefer Hekhalot*, which describes the transformation of Enoch/Metatron, the Prince of the Divine Presence, into the fiery creature:

> R. Ishmael said: The angel Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, the glory of highest heaven, said to me: When the Holy One, blessed be he, took me to serve the throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all needs of the Shekinah, at once my flesh turned to flame, my sinews to blazing fire, my bones to juniper coals, my eyelashes to lightning flashes, my eyeballs to fiery torches, the hairs of my head to hot flames, all my limbs to wings of burning fire, and the substance of my body to blazing fire.[78]

It is possible that the reference to the heavenly counterpart of Jacob in the form of his image (engraved) on the Throne of Glory also implies that Jacob is one of the servants of the Divine Face. This possibility is already hinted at in the biblical account where Jacob is attested as one who saw God face to face.[79] Moreover, in some of Jacob's traditions, he is directly described (in a manner similar to Enoch/Metatron) as the Prince of the Divine Face. We learn about this title from the *Prayer of Joseph* 8,[80] where Jacob-Israel himself unveils his status as the *Sar*[81] *ha-Panim*,[82] proclaiming that he is «the first minister before the Face of God».

---

[78] *3 En.* 15:1. Alexander, 3 Enoch... 267.

[79] Gen. 32:30 «...it is because I saw God face to face (פנים אל־ פנים)».

[80] The tradition about Jacob as the *Prince* of Presence seems to be also reflected in *Targ. Onq.* to Gen. 32:29: «Whereupon, he said, "No longer shall your name be called Jacob, but rather Israel; for your are a *prince* before the Lord and among men; therefore have you prevailed"» (The Targum Onqelos to Genesis... 116).

[81] Vermes notices that *Targum Neofiti* explains the etymology of Israel from שרר («to rule, to act as a prince»); see Vermes, The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies... 13.

[82] Gieschen, Angelomorphic Christology... 141–142.

It is also not coincidental that the initiation of Jacob into an angelic being involves another servant of the Face, the angel Sariel whose last name, Phanuel,[83] reflects his close proximity to the Face of God. As has been mentioned previously, this initiatory pattern is already observable in the Enochic tradition, where Sariel/Uriel/Phanuel (along with another angel of the Presence, Michael[84]) actively participates in the initiation of the another prominent servant of the Divine Face, Enoch/Metatron.

However, Jacob's identification with a *Sar ha-Panim* seems to be missing one detail that constitutes a distinct feature of the descriptions of visionaries initiated in this office, that is the luminous metamorphosis of an adept's face and body. The *Ladder of Jacob* and *Prayer of Joseph*, as well as the biblical account of Jacob's vision, are silent about any transformation of Jacob's body and his face. This tradition, however, can be found in another prominent account connected with the Jacob story.[85] In this important material, the eyes of Jacob, similar to the eyes of the transformed Metatron, are emitting flashes of lighting.

Conclusion

Finally, it is necessary to address the question why some theophanic traditions depict angelic beings as both the servants of the Face and the Face itself. Later Merkabah accounts categorize Metatron as the Face of God.[86]

[83] The fact that Sariel/Uriel/Phanuel is known under several names might indicate that this angel also serves as a heavenly counterpart in the manner similar to other servants of the Face such as Jacob-Israel, Enoch/Metatron, and possibly Melchizedek/Michael. On the identification of Michael with Melchizedek, see J. R. Davila, Melchizedek, Michael, and War in Heaven // *SBLSP* 35 (1996) 259–272; D. D. Hannah, Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity (Tübingen, 1999) (WUNT, 2/109) 70–74.

[84] Olyan refers to Rashi's passage which identifies «the 'angel of his presence' of Isa. 63:9 with Michael, the Prince of Presence» (Olyan, A Thousand Thousands Served Him… 108).

[85] The beginning of the second half of *Joseph and Aseneth* gives a description of Joseph and Aseneth visiting Jacob. *Jos. and Asen.* 22:7–8 says that when Aseneth saw Jacob, she «was amazed at his beauty... his eyes (were) flashing and darting (flashes of) lighting, and his sinews and his shoulders and his arms were like (those) of an angel, and his thighs and his calves and his feet like (those) of a giant. And Jacob was like a man who had wrestled with God. And Aseneth saw him and was amazed, and prostrated herself before him face down to the ground» (C. Burchard, Joseph and Aseneth // OTP. Vol. 2. 177–247 (238)).

[86] For the identification of Metatron with the Face, see De Conick, Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship… 329; D. J. Halperin, The Faces of the Chariot (Tübingen, 1988) (TSAJ, 16) 424–425. Morray-Jones notes that in the Merkabah texts Metatron «in some sense embodies, the *Kabod*». Morray-Jones, Transformation Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition… 9.

The reference to Uriel/Sariel, who is also known as Phanuel («the Face of God»), can serve as another example. This ambiguity in the theophanic tradition is also apparent in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*, where the fiery Face can be taken as either God's *Kavod* or an enthroned vice-regent associated with the Face (i.e. the enthroned Jacob-Israel). The difficulty in discerning between these two luminous entities can be illustrated through a reference to a late «Enochic» passage (*3 En.)*, describing the enthronement of Metatron at the door of the seventh palace. From this account we learn that when one infamous visionary encountered the enthroned Metatron, he took it as something equal to the Chariot. Then, according to the story, the visionary opened his mouth and uttered: «There are indeed two powers[87] in heaven!»[88]

Besides other things, this account might serve as:

1. an additional evidence that some heavenly counterparts are indeed «mirrors» of the Face;

2. an important lesson about the evasive nature of the celestial «faces»; and

3. a warning about the possible perils for those who try to explain what these «faces» might really represent.

ABSTRACT

The study investigates the imagery of the heavenly counterpart of the visionary found in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*. The text describes Jacob's dream in which the patriarch sees the celestial «Face» as the fiery anthropomorphic extent, which serves as the embodiment of the Deity. This fiery extent, labeled in some biblical and intertestamental texts as the «Face», is related to the glorious celestial entity known in theophanic traditions as God's *Kavod*. It appears that in the *Ladder of Jacob* the fiery Face not only embodies God's Glory but also seems to represent the heavenly counterpart of Jacob. The bust of fire, labeled in the *Ladder* as the Face, can be associated with the heavenly «image» of Jacob engraved on the Throne of Glory. The traditions about the heavenly «image» of Jacob found in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob* demonstrate some similarities to the traditions found in several targumic texts which entertain the idea of the heavenly twin of Jacob.

[87] On «two powers in heaven», see Alan Segal's pioneering research in his Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism (Leiden, 1977) (SJLA, 25).

[88] Alexander, 3 Enoch… 268.

Andrei A. Orlov
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

EX 33 ON GOD'S FACE: A LESSON FROM THE ENOCHIC TRADITION

Exodus 33:18–23 depicts Moses who asks the Lord to show him His glory. Instead the Lord agrees to proclaim his name before Moses, telling him that it is impossible for a human being to see God's face.

In recent scholarship this prominent motif of Moses' story has become a stumbling block for students of the Hebrew Bible. Currently most biblical scholars agree upon apparent difficulties in the literary-critical analysis of this section of Exodus. M. Noth comments that «a literary-critical analysis of Exodus 33 is probably impossible».[1] B. Childs confirms that there are several fundamental exegetical problems with Exodus 33:18–23. «The most difficult one is to determine the role of this passage in its larger context».[2]

The internal logic of the passage about the Divine face is also problematic. The whole narrative about God's פנים in Ex 33 is quite perplexing. Ex 33:11 informs a reader that God would speak to Moses face to face (פנים אל פנים) as a man speaks with his friend. A few verses later, in 33:14–15, God promises Moses that His face will go (פני ילכו) with him. In the context of these promises and early testimonies about «face-to-face» relationships, it comes as a surprise that in 33:20 the Lord suddenly rejects Moses' request to see His face (לא תוכל לראת את־פני).

It is clear that the anthropomorphic tradition about the divine face in Ex 33 has a fragmentary character.[3] It may well contain polemics between the anthropomorphic position of the J source and the Deuteronomic theology of the divine name: instead of the seeing of God's face the Lord offers Moses to the hearing of His name.[4] M. Noth observes that Ex 33 can be seen as «a conglomeration of secondary accretions».[5]

[1] M. Noth, History of Pentateuchal Traditions (Englewood Cliffs, 1972) 31, n. 114.

[2] B. S. Childs, The Book of Exodus. A Critical, Theological Commentary (Philadelphia, 1974) 595.

[3] A. F. Campbell and M. A. O'Brien placed Ex 33 within the nonsource texts. Cf. A. F. Campbell, M. A. O'Brien, Sources of the Pentateuch: Texts, Introductions, Annotations (Minneapolis, 1993) 263.

[4] The Old Testament materials reveal complicated polemics for and against anthropomorphic understanding of God. Scholars agree that the anthropomorphic imagery of the Hebrew Bible was «crystallized» in the tradition, known to us as the Priestly source. Moshe Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School (Oxford,

[5] Noth, History of Pentateuchal Traditions… 31, n. 114.

The apparent difficulties one encounters in clarifying the concept of the divine face within the context of the known sources of the Pentateuch call for an investigation of the broader biblical and extrabiblical traditions where this motif could be possibly preserved in its extended form. Implicitly linked to the «original» Exodus motif, these later «interpretations» might provide some additional insights which may help us better understand the fragmentary tradition preserved in chapter 33. This study will focus on one of the possible echoes of Ex 33 — the theophanic tradition of the divine countenance preserved in the corpus of the Enochic writings.

The Face of the Lord

The *Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch*, a Jewish text, apparently written in the first century CE, contains two striking theophanic descriptions involving the motif of the divine face. The first one occurs in *2 Enoch* 22 which portrays Enoch's encounter with the Lord in the celestial realm. Enoch recounts:

> I saw the view of the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot in a fire and brought out, and it emits sparks and is incandescent. Thus even I saw the face of the Lord. But the face of the Lord is not to be talked about, it is so very marvelous and supremely awesome and supremely frightening. And who am I to give an account of the incomprehensible being of the

1972) 191. Theological developments of the Priestly tradition demonstrate that the anthropomorphism of the Priestly source is intimately connected with the place of the Divine habitation. In this tradition, «in which the Divinity is personalized and depicted in the most tangible corporeal similitudes», God, who possesses a human form, has a need for a house or tabernacle. (Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School… 191). Weinfeld rightly observes that this anthropomorphic position was not entirely an invention of the Priestly source, but derives from early sacral conceptions found in the early sourses. In these traditions the Deity was sitting in his house ensconced between the two cherubim, and at his feet rests the ark, his footstool. In spite of the active promulgation of anthropomorphic concepts in some Old Testament materials, like J, P, and Ezekelian sources, the Hebrew Bible also contains polemics against God's corporeality. Scholars note the sharp opposition of the book of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic school to the anthropomorphism of the Priestly source and early anthropomorphic traditions. In their opinion, Deuteronomic school «first initiated the polemic against the anthropomorphic and corporeal conceptions of the Deity and that it was afterwards taken up by the prophets Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah». (Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School… 198). In contrast to the anthropomorphic imagery of J and P, the Deuteronomic school promulgates anticorporeal theology of the divine name with its conception of sanctuary (tabernacle) as the place where only God's name dwells. On Deuteronomic antianthropomorphism, see T. N. D. Mettinger, The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies (Lund, 1982) (ConBOT, 18); Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School… 191–209.

> Lord, and of his face, so extremely strange and indescribable? And how many are his commands, and his multiple voice, and the Lord's throne, supremely great and not made by hands, and the choir stalls all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, and their never-silent singing. Who can give an account of his beautiful appearance, never changing and indescribable, and his great glory? And I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord (*2 Enoch* 22:1–4, the longer recension).[6]

In chapter 39 Enoch reports this theophanic experience to his sons during his short visit to the earth, adding some new details. Although both portrayals demonstrate a number of terminological affinities, the second account explicitly connects the divine face with the Lord's anthropomorphic «extent». The following account is drawn from the shorter recension of *2 Enoch*:

> And now, my children it is not from my lips that I am reporting to you today, but from the lips of the Lord who has sent me to you. As for you, you hear my words, out of my lips, a human being created equal to yourselves; but I have heard the words from the fiery lips of the Lord. For the lips of the Lord are a furnace of fire, and his words are the fiery flames which come out. You, my children, you see my face, a human being created just like yourselves; I am one who has seen the face of the Lord,[7] like iron made burning hot by a fire, emitting sparks. For you gaze into my eyes, a human being created just like yourselves; but I have gazed into the eyes of the Lord, like the rays of the shining sun[8] and terrifying the eyes of

[6] F. I. Andersen, 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 136. The shorter recension of the Slavonic text gives a less elaborated description of the Lord's appearance: «I saw the Lord. His face was strong and very glorious and terrible. Who (is) to give an account of the dimensions of the being of the face of the Lord, strong and very terrible? Or his many-eyed ones and many-voiced ones, and the supremely great throne of the Lord, not made by hands, or those who are in attendance all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, or how unvarying and indescribable and never-silent and glorious is his service. and I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord». Cf. ibid. 137. Andersen observes that the absence of the comparison with hot iron in the MSS of the shorter recension shows the embarrassment of scribes over this attempt to describe the Lord's appearance (ibid.).

[7] Slav. **лице Господне.**

[8] The important detail of this description is the solar symbolism, which plays an important role in *2 Enoch*. The text often uses solar metaphors in various descriptions of angelic beings; e.g., in chapter 1 where Enoch meets two angels with «faces like the shining sun». Later, during his heavenly journey, Enoch sees «a group of seven angels, brilliant and very glorious with faces more radiant than the radiance of the sun». The images of fire and light are often involved in these solar descriptions of angelic hosts. The text pictures «...glorious and shining and many-eyed stations of the Lord's servants... and of the ranks of powerful fireborn heavenly armies». Andersen rightly observes that «fire and light are fundamental elements in the physics of *2 Enoch*». Andersen, 2 Enoch... 104.

> a human being. You, my children, you see my right hand beckoning you, a human being created identical to yourselves; but I have seen the right hand of the Lord, beckoning me, who fills heaven. You see the extent of my body, the same as your own; but I have seen the extent of the Lord,[9] without measure and without analogy, who has no end... To stand before the King, who will be able to endure the infinite terror of the great burning (*2 Enoch* 39:3–8).[10]

In both theophanic descriptions the notion of the Lord's «face» plays a crucial role. It is not a coincidence that in both of them the «face» is associated with light and fire. In biblical theophanies smoke and fire often serve as a divine envelope that protects mortals from the sight of the divine form. Radiant luminosity emitted by the Deity fulfills the same function, signaling the danger of the direct vision of the divine form. Luminosity also represents the screen which protects the Deity from the necessity of revealing its true form. Scholars note that in some theophanic traditions God's form remains hidden behind His light.[11] The hidden כבוד is revealed through this light, which serves as the luminous screen, «the face» of this anthropomorphic extent. *2 Enoch*'s theophanies which use the metaphors of light and fire may well be connected with such traditions where the divine «extent» is hidden behind the incandescent «face», which covers and protects the sovereignty of the Lord.

In *2 Enoch* 39:3–6 the «face» is closely associated with the divine «extent» and seems to be understood not simply as a part of the Lord's body (His face) but as a radiant *façade* of His anthropomorphic «form».[12] This identification between the Lord's face and the Lord's «form» is reinforced by an additional parallel pair in which Ehoch's face is identified with Enoch's «form»:

> You, my children, you see my face, a human being created just like yourselves; but I am one who has seen the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot by a fire, emitting sparks.... And you see the form of my body, the same as your own: but I have seen the form (extent) of the Lord, without measure and without analogy, who has no end (*2 Enoch* 39:3–6).

---

[9] Slav. **ѡбьѧтиѥ Гоⷭподнѥ**.

[10] MSS of the longer recension do not demonstrate substantial differences with this description.

[11] April De Conick's pioneering research shows that in Enochic traditions God's form remains hidden behind his light. A. De Conick, Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas (Leiden, 1996) (SVC, 33) 104–105.

[12] Gershom Scholem's research on the presence of the שיעור קומה traditions in *2 Enoch* 39 helps to clarify the «anthropomorphic» character of the Lord's «extent» in *2 Enoch*. See G. Scholem, The Age of *Shiur Komah* Speculation and a Passage in Origen // idem, Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition (New York, 1965) 36–42; idem, Origins of the Kabbalah (Princeton, 1990) 20.

The association between the divine face and divine form in *2 Enoch* 39:3–6 alludes to the biblical tradition from Ex 33:18–23 where the divine *panim* is mentioned in connection with his glorious divine form — God's *Kavod*:[13]

> Then Moses said, «Now show me your glory (כבדך)». And the Lord said, «I will cause all my goodness to pass in front of you, and I will proclaim my name, the Lord, in your presence... but», he said, «you cannot see my face (פני), for no one may see me and live».

It is clear that in the biblical passage the impossibility of seeing the Lord's face is understood not simply as the impossibility of seeing the particular part of the Lord but rather as the impossibility of seeing the complete range of His glorious «body». The logic of the whole passage, which employs such terms as God's «face» and God's «back», suggests that the term *panim* refers to the «forefront» of the divine extent. The imagery of the divine face found in Psalms[14] also favors this motif of the identity between the Lord's face and His anthropomorphic «form». For example, in Ps 17:15 the Lord's face is closely associated with His form or likeness (תמונה):

> As for me, I shall behold your face (פניך)[15] in righteousness; when I awake, I shall be satisfied with beholding your form (תמונתך).[16]

It is evident that all three accounts, Ex 33:18–23, Ps 17:15, and *2 Enoch* 39:3–6, represent a single tradition in which the divine face serves as the *terminus technicus* for the designation of the Lord's anthropomorphic extent.

---

[13] The term כבוד can be translated as «substance», «body», «mass», «power», «might», «honor», «glory», «splendor». In its meaning as «glory» כבוד usually refers to God, his sanctuary, his city, or sacred paraphernalia. The Priestly tradition uses the term in connection with God's appearances in the tabernacle. P and Ezekiel describe כבוד as a blazing fire surrounded by radiance and a great cloud. M. Weinfeld, כבוד // TDOT. Vol. 7. 22–38.

[14] On the Face of God in Psalms see: S. Balentine, The Hidden God: The Hiding Face of God in the Old Testament (Oxford, 1983) 49–65; W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament. 2 vols (Philadelphia, 1967) Vol. 2. 35–39; M. Fishbane, Form and Reformulation of the Biblical Priestly Blessing // *JAOS* 103 (1983) 115–121; J. Reindl, Das Angesicht Gottes im Sprachgebrauch des Alten Testaments (Leipzig, 1970) (ETS, 25) 236–237; M. Smith, Seeing God in the Psalms: The Background to the Beatific Vision in the Hebrew Bible // *CBQ* 50 (1988) 171–183.

[15] Note also that poetic rhyme תמונתך/פניך further reinforces the correspondence between the face and the form of God in this passage.

[16] Although the passage uses a different terminology, namely, the term תמונה, the identification still has a strong anthropomorphic flavor. The term תמונה can be translated as form, likeness, semblance, or representation.

Apparently, all these accounts deal with the specific anthropomorphic manifestation known as God's *Kavod*.[17] The possibility of such identification is already hinted at in Ex 33 where Moses who asks the Lord to show him His *Kavod* receives the answer that it is impossible for him to see the Lord's «face». The correlation of the divine face with «likeness» (תמונה) in Ps 17:15 can be also an allusion to *Kavod*, which in Ez 1:28 is described as «the likeness of the glory of the Lord (דמות כבוד יהוה)».

There is another early Mosaic account which correlates the Sinai encounter with *Kavod*. This important tradition, found in the fragments of the drama «Exodus» written by Ezekiel the Dramatist, depicts Moses' experience at Sinai as the vision of God's anthropomorphic *Kavod*:[18]

> I dreamt there was on the summit of mount Sinai
> A certain great throne (θρόνον μέγαν) extending up to heaven's cleft,
> On which there sat a certain noble man
> Wearing a crown and holding a great scepter in his left hand.[19]

W. Meeks observes that this passage may be safely taken as a witness to traditions of the second century BCE, since it was quoted by Alexander Polyhistor who lived around 80–40 BCE.[20] It means that by the second century BCE Moses' association with *Kavod*, hinted at in Ex 33, was already surrounded by an elaborate imagery, in which the Throne of Glory played a crucial role.

2 Enoch 22 further strengthens this theophanic pattern in which the encounter with the Divine Face is understood as the vision of God's throne. The text gives a number of evidences which prove that the anthropomorphic «extent», identified with the divine face, indeed represents His *Kavod*. The theophany of the divine countenance in the Slavonic apocalypse is surrounded by a peculiar *Kavod* imagery, which plays a prominent role in the Ezekelian account. The following parallels are noteworthy:

1. The theophany of the divine face took place in the highest of the heaven.[21] The highest of the heaven is a traditional place of God's Throne, the

[17] *Contra* W. Eichrodt who insists that the *panim* had no connection with the *Kavod*. He argues that the two concepts derive from different roots, and were never combined with one another. Cf. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament… Vol. 2. 38.

[18] P. W. van der Horst observes that Ezekiel the Dramatist's vision of God in human shape seated on the throne is based on the first chapter of the biblical Ezekiel. Cf. P. W. van der Horst, Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist // *JJS* 34 (1983) 24.

[19] C. R. Holladay, Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors. 4 vols. (Atlanta, 1989) (Texts and Translations, 30; Pseudepigrapha Series, 12) Vol. 2. 363.

[20] W. Meeks, The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology (Leiden, 1967) (SNT, 14) 149. Cf. also Holladay, Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors… Vol. 2. 308–312.

[21] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 136–37.

abode of His Glory. A later account found in *3 Enoch* tells us that «In *ʿArabot* there are 660 thousands of myriads of glorious angels, hewn out of flaming fire, standing opposite the throne of glory. The glorious King covers his face, otherwise the heaven of *ʿArabot* would burst open in the middle, because of the glorious brilliance…».[22]

2. The theophanic description in *2 Enoch* 22 refers to «His many-eyed ones»,[23] alluding to האופנים, the Wheels, the special class of the Angels of the Throne who in Ezekiel 1:18 are described as the angelic beings «full of eyes (מל את עינים)».

3. A reference to the «many-voiced ones» probably alludes to choirs of angelic hosts surrounding the Throne.

4. Finally, in *2 Enoch* 22 there is a direct reference to the throne of the Lord, which occupies a central place in the theophanic description, and is pictured as «supremely great and not made by hands».[24] The Throne of Glory is surrounded by the armies of the angelic hosts, the cherubim and the seraphim, with «their never-silent singing».[25]

Moses' Face

Previous research shows that the correlation between God's face and his luminous form (his glorious *Kavod*) was already implicitly articulated in Ex 33. The Enochic theophany found in *2 Enoch* further strengthens this connection, giving a theophanic description of the Lord's face as his terrifying «extent» which emits light and fire.

The important detail of these two accounts is the «danger motif» — the warnings about the peril of seeing the Deity. Both of them contain specific references to the harmful effect this theophanic experience has on the mortals who dare to behold the Divine face. In Ex 33:20 the Lord warns Moses about the danger of seeing His face: «You cannot see my face, for no one may see me and live». The motif of peril is further reinforced by the Lord's instructions in 33:22 where he commands Moses to hide himself into a cleft in the rock and promises to protect the prophet with His hands.

The «danger motif» also looms large in *2 Enoch*. In *2 Enoch* 39, immediately after his description of the theophany of the face, Enoch gives warning to his children about the danger of this theophanic experience:

> Frightening and dangerous it is to stand before the face of an earthly king, terrifying and very dangerous it is, because the will of the king is death and

[22] P. S. Alexander, 3 Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 305.

[23] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 137.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Ibid.

> the will of the king is life. How much more terrifying [and dangerous] it is to stand before the face of the King of earthly kings and of the heavenly armies, [the regulator of the living and of the dead]. Who can endure that endless misery? (*2 Enoch* 39:8).[26]

The «danger motif» in Ex 33 and in *2 Enoch* implicitly suggests that both of these accounts support the idea that the human being actually can see the face of God. M. Weinfeld argues that the warning about the danger of seeing the Deity usually affirms the possibility of such an experience. In his observations about antianthropomorphic tendencies of Deuteronomy, Deutero-Isaiah and Jeremiah, he points to the fact that these texts demonstrate a lack of usual warnings about the danger of seeing the Deity found in pre-Deuteronomic books. He concludes that it happened because the Deuteronomic school cannot conceive of the possibility of seeing the Deity.[27]

The possibility of theophany hinted at in *2 Enoch* and Ex 33 might suggest that Exodus' account implicitly asserts that Moses could see the divine form.[28] The distinctive details in the depiction of Moses' face in Ex 34 may further support this conclusion. But before we explore this motif, let us again return to the narrative of *2 Enoch*.

From this Enochic account we learn that the vision of the Divine face had dramatic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endures radical changes as it becomes covered with the divine light. The important detail here is that the luminous transformation of Enoch takes place in front of the radiant «face» of the Lord. In 22:6 Enoch reports that he was lifted up and brought before the Lord's face by archangel Michael. The Lord decides to appoint Enoch as שר הפנים, the Prince of the Divine Presence: «Let Enoch come up and stand in front of my face forever».[29] Further, the Lord commanded archangel Michael to remove Enoch from earthly clothing, anoint him with the delightful oil, and put him into the clothes of the Lord's glory (22:8–9).[30] The text describes the actions of Michael, who anoints Enoch with the delightful oil and clothes him. The symbolism of light permeates the whole scene; the oil emanates the rays of the glittering sun «greater than the greatest light».[31] At

---

[26] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 164.

[27] Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School... 207.

[28] Another «Mosaic» account attributed to J, openly articulates this possibility: «With him (Moses) I speak mouth to mouth (פה אל־ פה), clearly and not in riddles; he sees the form (ותמנת) of the Lord». (Num 12:8).

[29] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 139.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Ibid. 138. Jarl Fossum provides a number of allusions to the theme of «shining oil» in *2 Enoch*. Cf. J. Fossum, The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on early Christology (Göttingen, 1995) (NTOA, 30) 84.

the end of this procedure, Enoch «had become like one of the glorious ones,[32] and there was no observable difference».[33]

In Enoch's radiant metamorphosis before the Divine face an important detail can be found which links Enoch's transformation with Moses' account in Exodus. In *2 Enoch* 37 we learn about the unusual procedure performed on Enoch's face on the final stage of his encounter with the Lord. The text informs us that the Lord called one of his senior angels to chill the face of Enoch. The text says that the angel appeared frigid; he was as white as snow, and his hands were as cold as ice. The text further depicts the angel chilling Enoch's face, who could not endure the terror of the Lord, «just as it is not possible to endure the fire of a stove and the heat of the sun...».[34] Right after this «chilling procedure», the Lord informs Enoch that if his face had not been chilled here, no human being would be able to look at his face.[35] This reference to the radiance of Enoch's face after his encounter with the Lord is an apparent parallel to the incandescent face of Moses after the Sinai experience in Ex 34.[36]

References to the shining countenance of a visionary found in *2 Enoch* return us again to the Exodus story. Ex 34:29–35 portrays Moses after his encounter with the Lord.[37] The passage tells that «when Moses came down from Mount Sinai ... he was not aware that his face was radiant, because he had spoken with the Lord». The strange logic of the last sentence, which points to anambiguous connection between the speech of the Lord as a cause of Moses' glowing face can be explained by the Enochic theophanic account where «the lips of the Lord are a furnace of fire, and his words are the fiery flames which come out».[38]

---

[32] Andersen observes that «this motif (Enoch's transformation into the glorious angel) seems to have been influenced by the legend of Moses, whose shining face was a reflection of God's magnificent glory». Andersen, 2 Enoch… 139.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid. 160.

[35] Ibid.

[36] About possible Mesopotamian provenance of this motif cf.: M. Haran, The Shining of Moses's Face: A Case Study in Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Iconography [Ex 34:29–35; Ps 69:32; Hab 3:4] // In the Shelter of Elyon (Sheffield, 1984) (JSOT, 31) 159–173; W. Propp, The Skin of Moses' Face — Transfigured or Disfigured? // *CBQ* 49 (1987) 375–386.

[37] On Moses' traditions see: R. Bloch, Die Gestalt des Moses in der rabbinischen Tradition // Moses in Schrift und Überlieferung (Düsseldorf, 1963) 95–171; G. W. Coats, Moses: Heroic Man, Man of God (Sheffield, 1988) (JSOTSup, 57); S. Hafemann, Moses in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Survey // *JSP* 7 (1990) 79–104; W. A. Meeks, The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology (Leiden, 1967) (NovTSup, 14); R. Polzin, Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History (New York, 1980).

[38] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 163.

These parallels between the later Enochic text and the biblical Mosaic account are not inappropriate. As will be demonstrated later, the connection between the Enochic and Mosaic accounts has quite ancient roots. Evidences of the early link between Enoch and Moses includes the already mentioned drama of Ezekiel the Dramatist, which was apparently written during the second century BCE.[39]

W. Meeks[40] and P. W. van der Horst[41] observe that the depiction of Moses in the drama of Ezekiel the Dramatist bears some similarities to Enoch's figure in the Enochic traditions. They note a number of remarkable allusions in the drama to the Enochic motifs and themes. These allusions include the following points:

1. Moses's account is depicted as his dream vision in a fashion similar to Enoch's dreams in *1 Enoch* and *2 Enoch*.

2. In the text Moses is «elevated» by God, who gives him the throne, the royal diadem,[42] and the scepter.

3. God appointed Moses as an eschatological judge of humankind able to see «things present, past and future»[43] — the traditional role of Enoch found already in early Enochic booklets.

4. Moses is an «expert» in «a variety of things», including cosmological and astronomical information:

> I beheld the entire circled earth
> Both beneath the earth and above the heaven,
> And a host of stars fell on its knees before me;
> I numbered them all,
> They passed before me like a squadron of soldiers.[44]

This preoccupation with various meteorological, astronomical and eschatological «secrets» are typical duties of the elevated Enoch which are here transferred to Moses apparently for the first time.[45]

---

[39] Holladay, Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors… Vol. 2. 312.

[40] Meeks, The Prophet-King… 147.

[41] van der Horst, Moses' Throne Vision… 21–29.

[42] The crowning of Enoch-Metatron became a prominent leitmotif in later Enochic tradition, especially, in *3 Enoch*. W. Meeks observes that the enthronement of Enoch-Metatron in *3 Enoch* «betrays interesting similarities to Moses' traditions». Meeks, The Prophet-King… 207. See also van der Horst who observes that «like Moses, Enoch is assigned a cosmic and divine function that involves the wearing of regalia». van der Horst, Moses' Throne Vision… 25.

[43] Holladay, Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors… Vol. 2. 367.

[44] Ibid. 365.

[45] R. H. Charles argued that this transition of Enoch's function to Moses first was made in *2 Apoc. Bar.*, where God shows Moses «the measures of the fire, also the depths of the abyss, and the weight of the winds, and the number of the drops of rain». APOT. Vol. 2. 514.

5. Finally, the motif of assigning the seat/throne is a peculiar feature of Enochic literature where Enoch-Metatron is depicted as a scribe[46] who has a seat (later a throne) in the heavenly realm.[47] *2 Enoch* 23:4 pictures the angel Vereveil who commands Enoch to sit down. «You sit down;[48] write everything...». And Enoch said, «And I sat down for a second period of 30 days and 30 nights, and I wrote accurately» (23:6).[49] The theme of Enoch-Metatron's seat became a prominent motif in rabbinic tradition, where according to *b.* Hag. 15a, the privilege of «sitting» beside God was accorded solely to Metatron by virtue of his character as a «scribe»: for he was granted permission as a scribe to sit and write down the merits of Israel.

The tacit links between Enoch and Moses found in the early Enochic theophanic tradition later become openly articulated in rabbinic literature. In this later enunciation, as in the initial encounters, the familiar theophanic motif from the Exodus story again plays a crucial role. From *3 Enoch* we learn that it is Enoch-Metatron, whose face once was transformed into fire,[50] who is now the one[51] who tells Moses about his shining visage: «At once

[46] In *1 Enoch* 74:2 Enoch writes the instructions of the angel Uriel regarding the secrets of heavenly bodies and their movements. M. Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments. 2 vols (Oxford, 1978) Vol. 2. 173. Qumran Enochic fragments (4QEnGiants 14; 4QEn 92:1) picture Enoch as «the scribe of distinction» ספר פרשא. Cf. J. T. Milik, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4 (Oxford, 1976) 261–262 and 305. In the *Book of Jubilees* Enoch is attested as «the first of mankind... who learned (the art of) writing, instruction, and wisdom and who wrote down in a book the signs of the sky...». J. C. VanderKam, The Book of Jubilees. 2 vols (Leuven, 1989) (CSCO, 510–511; Scriptores Aethiopici, 87–88) Vol. 2. 25–26.

[47] P. W. van der Horst also stresses unique features of Moses' enthronement in Ezekiel the Dramatist, which depart from Enochic and Merkabah imagery. He observes that «in Moses' vision, there is only one throne, God's. And Moses is requested to be seated on it, not at God's side but all alone. God leaves his throne. This scene is unique in early Jewish literature and certainly implies a deification of Moses». Van der Horst, Moses' Throne Vision... 25.

[48] Slav. сѣди.

[49] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 141.

[50] *3 Enoch* 15:1 depicts this radiant metamorphosis of Enoch-Metatron: «When the Holy One, blessed be he, took me to serve the throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all the needs of the Schekinah, at once my flesh turned to flame, my sinews to blazing fire, my bones to juniper coals, my eyelashes to lightning flashes, my eyeballs to fiery torches, the hairs of my head to hot flames, all my limbs to wings of burning fire, and the substance of my body to blazing fire». Alexander, 3 Enoch... 267.

[51] Scholars observe that in Merkabah tradition Metatron is explicitly identified with the Face of God. Cf.: A. De Conick, Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First-Century Christology in the Second Century // The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism / Ed. C. C. Newman, J. R. Davila, G. S. Le-

Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, said to Moses, Son of Amram, fear not! for already God favors you. Ask what you will with confidence and boldness, for light shines from the skin of your face from one end of the world to the other».[52]

Conclusion

The foregoing research has examined some extrabiblical materials related to the motif of the divine face found in Ex 33. The investigation has shown that the evolution of this motif in later traditions is dependent on the Enoch-Moses *gestalt*, which plays a prominent role in the Enochic theophanies of the divine face. This research, however, would not be complete without mentioning another important source which is also related to the traditions about the patriarch Enoch and the prophet Moses. This source is the priestly editor of the Pentateuch.

Much attention has been devoted to the peculiar interest of the priestly editor in anthropomorphic descriptions of the Deity.[53] M. Weinfeld and T. Mettinger show that the Priestly source played a crucial role in promoting biblical theophanic traditions. In these traditions Moses' figure has occupied an important place.[54]

The Priestly source also was the locus where the enigmatic figure of Enoch for the first time appeared in its esoteric complexity,[55] indicating that the priestly author was cognizant of the broader Enochic developments. Some scholars believe that perhaps it is «to some such developed Enoch tradition

---

wis (Brill, 1999) (JSJ, 63) 329; D. J. Halperin, The Faces of the Chariot (Tübingen, 1988) (TSAJ, 16) 424–425.

[52] *3 Enoch* 15B:5. Cf. Alexander, 3 Enoch… 304.

[53] On the issue of Old Testament's anthropomorphism see: J. Barr, Theophany and Anthropomorphism in the Old Testament // *VT Suppl.* 7 (1960) 31–38; J. Hempel, Die Grenzen des Anthropomorphismus Jahwes im Alten Testament // *ZAW* 57 (1939) 75–85; F. Michaeli, Dieu à l'image de l'homme: Étude de la notion anthropomorphique de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament (Neuchâtel, 1950); E. Jacob, Théologie de l'Ancien Testament (Neuchâtel, 1955) 30ff.; M. C. A. Korpel, A Rift in the Clouds. Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine (Münster, 1990) (UBL, 8) 87–590; T. N. D. Mettinger, The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies (Lund, 1982) (ConBOT, 18).

[54] Mettinger, The Dethronement of Sabaoth…; Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School… 191–209.

[55] The traditions about Enoch are different in J and P. For the discussion of the differences, see J. VanderKam, Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition (Washington, 1984) (CBQMS, 16) 23–51; H. S. Kvanvig, Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1988) (WMANT, 61) 40–53.

the author of Genesis is making reference when he emits his cryptic statements about Enoch in Genesis 5:22–24».[56]

Students of the Enochic tradition are now aware that the priestly editor was familiar with the peculiar Mesopotamian traditions[57] which constituted a conceptual framework for Enoch's figure.[58]

In these Mesopotamian traditions a prototype of Enoch, Enmeduranki, is portrayed as a «translated» figure, the one «who sat in the presence (*maḫar*)[59] of Shamash and Adad, the divine adjudicators».[60] This reference to Enmeduranki's access to the glorious presence/face of the solar deity[61] indicates

[56] M. Stone, Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origin // *JSJ* 19 (1988) 162.

[57] On the Mesopotamian traditions behind the Enoch's figure, see H. Zimmern, Urkönige und Uroffenbarung // E. Schrader, Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament. 2 vols (Berlin, 1902–1903) Vol. 2. 530–543; H. L. Jansen, Die Henochgestalt: Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung (Oslo, 1939) (Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1); P. Grelot, La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification // *RSR* 46 (1958) 5–26, 181–210; VanderKam, Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition…; Kvanvig, Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure…

[58] Important witnesses to these traditions include the various versions of the so-called Sumerian antediluvian King List, the materials which dated from 1500 B.C.E. to 165 B.C.E. The List demonstrates a number of similarities with the genealogy of Genesis 5. One of its interesting details is that Mesopotamian kings, as well as patriarchs from Genesis' account, had extraordinary long reigns, ranging from 3,600 to 72,000 years. A second important parallel is that two versions of the List give ten kings, the last of whom is designated as the hero of the flood. It demonstrates a close resemblance to the role of Noah who occupies the tenth place in the list of Genesis 5. J. VanderKam notes that «in the literature on Genesis 5 there is a well established tradition which holds that P modeled his pre-flood genealogy on a Mesopotamian list of antediluvian kings, the so-called Sumerian King List». VanderKam, Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition… 26. An important character of the Sumerian King list is Enmeduranki (Enmeduranna), the king of Sippar, the city of the sun-god Shamash. In three copies of the List he occupies the seventh place, which in Genesis' genealogy belongs to Enoch. Moreover, in other Mesopotamian sources Enmeduranki appears in many roles and situations which demonstrate remarkable similarities with Enoch's story. J. VanderKam's research shows that the priestly author was aware of these broader Mesopotamian traditions which served as a prototype for Enoch's figure, whose symbolical age of 365 years reflects the link between the patriarch and the solar cult of Shamash. VanderKam concludes that «the biblical image of Enoch is based on the Mesopotamian picture of Enmeduranki». Ibid. 50.

[59] In another text about Enmeduranki the same motif of the divine presence can be found: «...he may approach the presence (*maḫar*) of Shamash and Adad...». W. G. Lambert, Enmeduranki and Related Matters // *JCS* 21 (1967) 132.

[60] Ibid. 128 and 130.

[61] On Mesopotamian solar symbolism and its influence on biblical concepts, including the concept of the divine *panim* cf. A. Caquot, La Divinité Solaire Ougari-

that the later role of Enoch as *Sar ha-Panim*, the Prince of the Divine Presence or the Prince of the Face,[62] was already present in its rudimentary form in the Mesopotamian traditions known to the priestly editor.

In the light of these observations the idea that Ex 33 could actually contain the original Enochic motif is not inappropriate. The implicit link between the Enochic account of the divine Presence and the Mosaic account of the divine *panim* may well reflect the conceptual world of the priestly editor, who often «has expressed his acquaintance with a fairly broad range of Mesopotamian traditions in remarkably few words».[63]

ABSTRACT

The article examines the Enochic background of the imagery of the Divine Face found in Exodus 33. The study argues that Ex 33 could actually contain the original Enochic motif. In Mesopotamian traditions, a prototype of Enoch, Enmeduranki, is portrayed as a «translated» figure, the one who had access to the glorious presence/face of the solar deity. The implicit link between the Enochic account of the divine Presence and the Mosaic account of the divine *panîm* found in Ex 33 may well reflect the conceptual world of the priestly editor, who often «has expressed his acquaintance with a fairly broad range of Mesopotamian traditions in remarkably few words».

---

tique // *Syria* 36 (1959) 90–101; B. Janowski, Rettungsgewissheit und Epiphanie des Heils (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1989) (WMANT, 59) Vol. 1. 105ff.; B. Langer, Gott als «Licht» in Israel und Mesopotamien: Eine Studie zu Jes. 60:1–3.19f (Klosterneuburg, 1989) (Österreichische biblische Studien, 7); W. Smelik, On Mystical Transformation of the Righteous into Light in Judaism // *JSJ* 26 (1995) 122–144; M. Smith, The Early History of God: Yahweh and the other Deities in Ancient Israel (San Francisco, 1990); M. Smith, The Near Eastern Background of Solar Language for Yahweh // *JBL* 109/1 (1990) 29–39; H. P. Stähli, Solare Elemente im Jahweglauben des Alten Testaments (Freiburg—Göttingen, 1985) (OBO, 66).

[62] Some scholars argue that the biblical concept of the divine face also has Mesopotamian roots. M. Fishbane and M. Smith show that the language of the Lord's shining face was part of Israel's inheritance from ancient Near Eastern culture. Cf. M. Fishbane, Form and Reformulation of the Biblical Priestly Blessing // *JAOS* 103 (1983) 115–21; M. Smith, «Seeing God» in the Psalms: The Background to the Beatific Vision in the Hebrew Bible // *CBQ* 50 (1988) 171–183. Fishbane stresses that «the various and abundant use of such imagery in ancient Near Eastern literature, particularly from Mesopotamia where it recurs in a wide range of genres, suggests that ancient Israel absorbed such imagery as part and parcel of its rich patrimony». Fishbane, Form and Reformulation… 116.

[63] VanderKam, Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition… 50.

Andrei A. Orlov
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

ON THE POLEMICAL NATURE OF *2 (SLAVONIC) ENOCH*: A REPLY TO C. BÖTTRICH

In one of the recent issues of the *Journal for the Study of Judaism*[1] Christfried Böttrich offered his criticism[2] of my article[3] dedicated to the polemical developments in the shorter recension of the Melchizedek legend of *2 Enoch*.

In his critical response C. Böttrich denied the possibility of any polemics not only in the Melchizedek story but also in the whole text of the Slavonic apocalypse. He stated that «polemics are not heard elsewhere in the narration; the picture of a still unified archaic mankind has no place for them».[4]

Böttrich's strong negative reaction to the possibility of polemics in the Slavonic apocalypse must be understood in the context of his own scholarship. If such polemical developments do indeed exist, they pose a serious problem to Böttrich's research on *2 Enoch*; this research has been for many years conducted without any recognition or consideration of such polemics. The existence of these polemical developments would reveal, therefore, the obvious flaw of his methodological approach, which has been unable to grasp

---

[1] C. Böttrich, The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reaction to A. Orlov // *JSJ* 32.4 (2001) 445–470.

[2] All Böttrich's criticism rests on his single erroneous assumption that *2 Enoch* 71:32–33, which I used in my argument, represents an interpolation. This assumption is simply incorrect. There is nothing Christian in these two verses. They are presented in both recensions in all major MSS of *2 Enoch*. A simple comparison of two recensions provides additional proof that it is not an interpolation. In the shorter recension an interpolation in 71:34–36 is absent. If 71:32–33 also belongs to this interpolation it is difficult to explain why these verses are still preserved in the shorter recension. It should be noted that previous translators A. Vaillant and F. Andersen did not consider *2 Enoch* 71:31–32 as an interpolation. Cf. A. Vaillant, Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française (Paris, 1952) 80–82; F. Andersen, 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 208 note p. It is unfortunate that Böttrich did not read my other article on the same subject (A. Orlov, «Noah's Younger Brother»: Anti-Noachic Polemics in *2 Enoch* // *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259–273) where I further develop my argument about the polemical nature of the Melchizedek story of *2 Enoch* on the materials of the longer recension. In this article I demonstrated the important role that *2 Enoch* 71:31–32 play in the anti-Noachic polemics of the Slavonic apocalypse.

[3] A. Orlov, Melchizedek Legend of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch // *JSJ* 31 (2000) 23–38.

[4] Böttrich, «The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch… 465.

the polemical character of the text. Moreover, if the investigation were to proceed with the proper methodology, one which takes into consideration the polemical nature of *2 Enoch*, a large number of Böttrich's conclusions on the theology, the history of the transmission, and the role of Jewish mystical traditions in the text would be dismissed as erroneous.

My reply to Christfried Böttrich, however, should not proceed solely as an exposition of the errors of his previous research, but should rather take a form of a further demonstration of the polemical nature of the Slavonic apocalypse. This chapter, therefore, will seek to investigate the Adamic polemics in *2 Enoch*, one of the most important polemical developments taking place in the Slavonic apocalypse; this polemical development, unfortunately, completely escaped Böttrich's attention.[5] By this investigation I will try to demonstrate that the polemics permeate the whole text and that without consideration of them any research on *2 Enoch* ends inevitably in a blind alley.

The Function of the Adamic Tradition in 2 Enoch

Adam's story occupies a prominent place in *2 Slavonic (Apocalypse of) Enoch*. The traditions pertaining to the first human can be found in all the sections of the book.[6] In these materials Adam is depicted as a glorious angelic being, predestined by God to be the ruler of the earth, but falling short of God's expectations. Although a major bulk of Adamic materials belongs to the longer recension, which includes, for example, the lengthy Adamic narrative in chapters 30–32, the Adamic tradition is not confined solely to this recension. A number of important Adamic passages are also attested in the shorter recension. The extensive presence of Adamic materials in both recensions and their significance for the theology of the Slavonic apocalypse indicates that they are not later interpolations but are part of the original layer of the text.

It should be noted that such an extensive presence of Adamic materials in the intertestamental Enochic text is quite unusual. In the early Enochic circle, included in the composition known as *1 (Ethiopic) Enoch,* Adam does not figure prominently. His presence in these materials is marginal and limited to a few insignificant remarks. Besides these few short references to the first humans,[7] the early Enochic booklets are silent about the traditions associated

[5] It is remarkable that Böttrich's book dedicated to the Adamic tradition in *2 Enoch* (C. Böttrich, Adam als Microkosmos (Berlin, 1995) (Judentum und Umwelt, 59)) does not have even one word on the polemical nature of the Adamic narrative in the Slavonic apocalypse. The question of the influence of the Adamic tradition on the image of Enoch is also completely ignored.

[6] *2 Enoch* 30:8–32:2; 33:10; 41:1; 42:5; 44:1; 58:1–3; 71:28.

[7] See, *1 Enoch* 32:6; 37:1; 60:8; 69:9–11; 85:3; 90:37–38.

with the protoplast. Moreover, Adam's image in *1 Enoch* is quite different from the one attested in the Slavonic apocalypse. *1 Enoch's* materials do not give any specific details about the elevated status of the protoplast. For example, the *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 Enoch* 85:3) depicts Adam as a white bull. Although white is a positive symbol in the imagery of *An. Ap.*,[8] scholars note that, in general, this allegory does not indicate goodness or elevation, but rather lineage.[9] Thus, in *An. Ap.* all the sheep are white, even the blinded ones. The white color, therefore, does not serve as a sign of the elevated or angelic status of the protoplast. Sethites, for instance, are also depicted as white bulls. If the authors or editors of *An. Ap.* want to stress the angelic status of a character, they usually depict it in transformation from an animal into a human. Thus, in Ethiopic and Aramaic versions of *An. Ap.* (*1 Enoch* 89:36), Moses is portrayed as the one who was transformed from a sheep into a man during his encounter with God on Mount Sinai. Moses' «humanization» points to his transition to angelic status. The same process can be found in the Ethiopic version of *An. Ap.* (*1 Enoch* 89:9) where Noah's angelic metamorphosis is symbolically depicted as a transformation from a white bovid into a man.[10] Such «humanization», however, was never applied to Adam in *An. Ap.*

The modest role which Adam plays in the early Enochic circle can be explained by several factors. Scholars previously observed that Enochic and Adamic traditions often offer contending explanations of the origin of evil in the world.[11] The Enochic tradition bases its understanding of the origin of evil on the Watchers story, where the fallen angels corrupt human beings by passing on to them various celestial secrets. In contrast, the Adamic tradition traces the source of evil to Satan's disobedience and the transgression of Adam and Eve in Eden.

From the point of view of this long-lasting contention between Adamic and Enochic traditions, it might appear that the sudden occurrence of the large bulk of Adamic materials in *2 Enoch* represents alien accretions skillfully interpolated into the original narrative during its long transmission in the Greek and Slavonic milieux.

A closer examination of the text, however, shows that the presence of the Adamic tradition in the Slavonic apocalypse is not secondary or coincidental

[8] P. Tiller, A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch (Atlanta, 1993) (EJL, 4) 226.

[9] Ibid. 226.

[10] The «humanization» of Noah is not attested in the Aramaic. See: Tiller, A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch… 267.

[11] M. Stone, The Axis of History at Qumran // Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls / Ed. E. Chazon, M. E. Stone (Leiden, 1999) (STDJ, 31) 133–149.

but has a profound conceptual value for the whole theological framework of the Slavonic apocalypse. It appears that the purpose of the extensive presence of Adamic materials in *2 Enoch* can be explained through the assessment of Enoch's image in the text.

Scholars have previously noted that Enoch's figure, portrayed in the various sections of *2 Enoch*, is more complex than in the early Enochic tractates of *1 Enoch*.[12] For the first time, the Enochic tradition seeks to depict Enoch, not simply as a human taken to heaven and transformed into an angel, but as a celestial being exalted above the angelic world.[13] In this attempt, one may find the origins of another image of Enoch, very different from the early Enochic literature, which was developed much later in Merkabah mysticism — the concept of the supreme angel Metatron, «the Prince of the Presence».[14] It is, therefore, possible that this new profile of the elevated Enoch in the Slavonic apocalypse can serve as an important clue to unriddling the mysteries of the extensive Adamic presence in *2 Enoch*.

---

[12] P. Alexander, From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch // Biblical Figures Outside the Bible / Ed. M. E. Stone, T. A. Bergen (Harrisburg, 1998) 102–104; H. Odeberg, 3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch (New York, 1973) 52–63.

[13] One can argue that the beginning of this process can be seen already in the *Book of the Similitudes* where Enoch seems to be identified with the Son of Man. It is possible that the *Similitudes,* written close to the time of *2 Enoch*, also reflects this process of transition to the new image of Enoch. In contrast to *2 Enoch*, the *Similitudes,* however, does not elaborate this process to the same degree as the Slavonic apocalypse does. Enoch's transformation into the Son of Man in the *Similitudes* 71 is rather instantaneous and ambiguous. In contrast, in *2 Enoch* this process of Enoch's transition to new super-angelic identity is described in detail through the expositions of Enoch's celestial titles which unfold the patriarch's new roles in numerous celestial offices. On Enoch's transformation in the *Similitudes*, see J. R. Davila, Of Methodology, Monotheism and Metatron // The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism. Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus / Ed. C. C. Newman, J. R. Davila, G. S. Lewis (Leiden, 1999) (SJSJ, 63) 9–15; C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology (Tübingen, 1997) (WUNT, 2/94) 151; M. Knibb, Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls // *DSD* 2 (1995) 177–180; D. W. Suter, Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch (Missoula, 1979) (SBLDS, 47) 14–23; J. VanderKam, Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71 // The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins / Ed. J. H. Charlesworth *et al.* (Minneapolis, 1992) 182–183.

[14] P. Alexander observes that «the transformation of Enoch in *2 Enoch* 22 provides the closest approximation, outside Merkabah literature, to Enoch's transformation in *3 Enoch* 3–13». P. Alexander, 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 248.

In 1987 Moshe Idel published an article[15] in which he explored the role of the Adamic traditions in shaping the image of Enoch as the supreme angel Metatron. Although Idel's research dealt mainly with later rabbinic materials, it demonstrated that already in some pseudepigraphic accounts Enoch appears to be portrayed as a luminous counterpart of Adam who regained Adam's glory lost during the protoplast's transgression.[16]

Idel further suggested that Enoch's luminous metamorphosis attested in *2 Enoch* 22 might also belong to the same tradition which views Enoch as the one who regained Adam's lost status and luminosity. He observed that to the best of his knowledge, «Enoch is the only[17] living person for whom… luminous garments, reminiscent of Adam's lost garments of light, were made».[18]

Philip Alexander, in his recent research, provides new insight into Idel's argument about the formative value of the Adamic tradition for the image of the elevated Enoch. Alexander points to a number of rabbinic passages in which the «supernatural radiance» of Adam's heavenly soul, which departed from him when he sinned, later returned to be reincarnated in Enoch.[19] He further observes that

> … behind these passages is a concept of Metatron as a divine entity first incarnate in Adam and then reincarnate in Enoch. Enoch, having perfected himself, in contrast to Adam, who sinned and fell, re-ascends to his heavenly home and takes his rightful place in the heights of the universe, above the highest angels ... Enoch thus becomes a redeemer figure — a second Adam through whom humanity is restored.[20]

It appears that the suggestions of scholars about the connection between Enoch and Adam are valid and deserve further investigation. It seems that the traces

[15] M. Idel, Enoch is Metatron // *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–240. The original Hebrew version of this article appeared in: Early Jewish Mysticism / Ed. J. Dan (Jerusalem, 1987).

[16] Idel points to one of such accounts, the Armenian text known as «The Words of Adam and Seth» where the following tradition can be found: «But he [Adam], not having observed the commandments, and having been stripped of the divine light, and having been thrown outside the Garden, became an equal of the dumb beast. And Enoch considered these things, and for forty days and for forty nights he did not eat at all. And after this he planted a luscious garden, and he planted in it fruit bearers and he was in the garden for five hundred and forty-two years, and after that, in body, he was taken up to heaven, and was found worthy of the divine glory and light». M. E. Stone, Armenian Apocrypha Relating to the Patriarchs and Prophets (Jerusalem, 1982) 12–13.

[17] It should be noted that rabbinic and Samaritan literature often depict Moses as a luminous counterpart of Adam who acquired a luminous garment during his encounter with the Lord on Mount Sinai.

[18] Idel, Enoch is Metatron… 224.

[19] Alexander, From Son of Adam to a Second God… 111.

[20] Ibid.

of the concept of Enoch as a second Adam can be detected already in *2 Enoch* where Enoch assumes the glorious status of the protoplast.

It is also significant that in the Slavonic apocalypse the luminosity is not the only quality that Enoch inherited from Adam. In this text, Enoch acquired a whole host of roles and qualities which the Adamic narrative of the Slavonic apocalypse associates with the protoplast. In the course of these polemical appropriations, the elevated angelic status of the prelapsarian Adam, his luminosity, his wisdom, and his special roles as the king of the earth and the steward of all earthly creatures are transferred to the new occupant of the celestial realm, the patriarch Enoch, who, near the Lord's throne, is transformed into one of the glorious ones initiated into the highest mysteries by the Lord, becomes the «manager of the arrangements on the earth», and writes down «everything that nourished» on it.

Our further analysis will demonstrate that the traditions about the prelapsarian conditions of Adam provide an initial background for the polemical appropriations. The features of Adam's story, his roles and offices, are used in *2 Enoch* as the building blocks[21] for creating the new, celestial identity of the elevated Enoch.

This investigation must now turn to the text of the *Slavonic Enoch* in order to explore in detail these polemical developments.

King of the Earth

2 Enoch 30:12 describes Adam as the king of the earth.[22] This honorable role in *2 Enoch*, as in the Genesis account, represents not merely an impressive metaphor but presupposes specific duties which demonstrate Adam's royal status. Most of these activities have biblical roots.[23] From *2 Enoch* 58:3, we learn that the Lord appointed Adam over

[21] It should be noted that the Adamic tradition is not the only «building material» used in *2 Enoch* in order to create the new, celestial image of Enoch. There is also a strong presence of the traditions about the elevated Moses which help to enhance Enoch's new identity in various theophanic settings throughout the text. On the Mosaic traditions in *2 Enoch* see, A. Orlov, Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition // *SBLSP* 39 (2000) 130–147; idem, The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob* // Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture. 2 vols / Ed. C. A. Evans (London, 2004) (Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity, 9) Vol. 2. 59–76.

[22] Slav. **царь земли**. М. И. Соколов, Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий, VII: Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного. Тексты, латинский пер. и исследование. Посмертный труд автора приготовил к изд. М. Сперанский // *ЧОИДР* 4 (1910) 1.30.

[23] On the connections between the Genesis account and the Adamic story of *2 Enoch*, see: J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, The Creation of Man and Woman in Early Jewish

> ...everything [as king], and he subjected everything to him in subservience under his hand, both the dumb and the deaf, to be commanded and for submission and for every servitude. So also to every human being. The Lord created mankind to be the lord of all his possessions.[24]

This description of Adam's duties corresponds to the account found in Gen 1:26–30 where God gives Adam dominion over «everything that has the breath of life».

As in Gen 2:19–20, one of the important functions of the new appointed king is the registration of all the «possessions», i.e., all the living creatures of the earth given to his stewardship through the act of their naming. *2 Enoch* 58 states that

> ...the Lord came down onto the earth [on account of Adam] and he inspected all his creatures which he himself had created in the beginning of the thousand ages and then after all those he had created Adam. And the Lord summoned all the animals of the earth and all reptiles of the earth and all the birds that fly in the air, and he brought them all before the face of our father Adam, so that he might pronounce names for all the quadrupeds; and [Adam] named everything that lives on the earth.[25]

Giving names here, just as in the Genesis account, also designates Adam's dominion over «everything that lives on the earth». This dominion, however, as in the Biblical account, is supervised by the Lord. The whole picture indicates that the author of *2 Enoch* understands Adam's «kingship» as the management of God's property.[26] It is significant that the Slavonic apocalypse defines Adam's role as «the lord of all God's possessions».[27]

Literature // The Creation of Man and Woman: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions / Ed. G. P. Luttikhuizen (Leiden, 2000) (TBN, 3) 34–62.

[24] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 184.

[25] Ibid. 185.

[26] Cf. Philo, *Opif.* 88 «So the Creator made man after all things, as a sort of driver and pilot, to drive and steer the things on earth, and charged him with the care of animals and plants, like a *governor* subordinate to the chief and great King». Philo / Tr. F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker. 11 vols (Cambridge, Mass., 1949) Vol. 1. 73. See, also: J. R. Levison, Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch (Sheffield, 1988) (JSPSS, 1) 66–68.

[27] Adam's designation as the second angel in *2 Enoch* 30:11 also seems to point to the protoplast's role as the viceroy of God. Cf. Philo, *Opif.* 148 «...and the first man was wise with a wisdom learned from and taught by Wisdom's own lips, for he was made by divine hands; he was, moreover, a king, and it befits a ruler to bestow titles on his several subordinates. And we may guess that the sovereignty with which that first man was invested was a most lofty one, seeing that God had fashioned him with the utmost care and deemed him worthy of the *second* place, making him His own viceroy and the lord of all others». *Philo* 1.117. It is also important that in *2 Enoch*

In the Slavonic apocalypse, however, the governing role of Adam as the lord of all God's possesions is challenged by the account of Enoch's kingship and his role as «the manager of the arrangements on the earth». This new role of Enoch vividly recalls the former royal status of the protoplast.

The first hint about Enoch's role as the governing power on earth comes from chapter 39 where Enoch relates to his children the details of his encounter with the divine anthropomorphic extent, identified in the text as the Lord's «Face». Enoch's description provides a series of analogies in which the earthly Enoch compares his face and parts of his body with the attributes of the Lord's Face and body. At the end of his description, Enoch delivers the following conclusion:

> Frightening and dangerous it is to stand before the face of the earthly king, terrifying and very dangerous it is, because the will of the king is death and the will of the king is life. How much more terrifying [and dangerous] it is stand before the face of the King of earthly kings and of the heavenly armies... Who can endure that endless misery?[28]

In the light of the overall logic of the patriarch's speech, in which the «attributes» of the Lord have been compared with Enoch's «attributes», it becomes clear that the earthly king of the story is Enoch himself. This interpretation is «confirmed» by the manuscripts of the shorter recension which directly identify Enoch as the earthly king:

> And now my children, listen to the discourses of an earthly king. It is dangerous and perilous to stand *before the face of the earthly king*,[29] terrifying [and very perilous] it is...[30]

The designation of Enoch as the royal/governing power on earth is not confined solely to the passage found in chapter 39. *2 Enoch* 46:1–2 (the longer recension) also recounts the tradition about Enoch as the earthly king. There again Enoch refers to his royal status indirectly in third person.[31]

The significant feature of Enoch's designation as the earthly king in the Slavonic apocalypse is that this text understands Enoch not as one of the earthly kings, but as *the* king of the earth who, in a manner similar to the

---

the realm of Adam's dominion is designated as *another world*: «And the devil understood how I wished to create another world, so that everything could be subjected to Adam on the earth, to rule and reign over it». *2 Enoch* 31:3. Andersen, 2 Enoch... 154.

[28] *2 Enoch* 39:8 (the longer recension). Andersen, 2 Enoch... 164.

[29] Slav. **пред лицем царѣ земнаго.**

[30] *2 Enoch* 39:8. Andersen, 2 Enoch... 165.

[31] «Listen, my people, and give heed to the utterance of my lips! If to an earthly king someone should bring some kinds of gifts, if he is thinking treachery in his heart, and the king perceives it, will he not be angry with him?» Andersen, 2 Enoch... 172.

protoplast, supervises all arrangements on the earth. This exclusive role is hinted at in *2 Enoch* 64, which depicts the patriarch's address to the *princes of the people* as they prostrate themselves before him. This role is also intimated in chapter 43 of the shorter recension and a similar passage from *2 Enoch* found in the Slavonic collection the «Just Balance» (Slav. «*Мерило праведное*»), where Enoch is described as the manager of the earth:

> ...and behold my children, I am the manager of the arrangements on earth, I wrote (them) down. and the whole year I combined and the hours of the day. And the hours I measured: and I wrote down every seed on earth. And I compared every measure and the just balance I measured. And I wrote (them) down, just as the Lord commanded...[32]

It should be noted that the definition of Enoch as the king is a unique motif in early Enochic materials.[33] In *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees,* and the *Book of Giants,* the patriarch is often described as an intercessor, a visionary, a scribe, an expert in secrets, but never directly as a king.[34] It, therefore, becomes apparent that the royal/governing functions of Enoch are construed in the Slavonic apocalypse in the context of its polemical response to the Adamic tradition; it serves as a counterpart to the royal status of the protoplast. It is not therefore coinci-

[32] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 217.

[33] I am indebted to Professor James VanderKam for this clarification.

[34] Although Enoch's role as the governing power on earth is unknown in the early Enochic materials, it does not mean that such a designation of Enoch in the Slavonic apocalypse is a foreign interpolation invented by the Greek or Slavic scribes. It appears that the depiction of Enoch as the governing power on earth represents an important step in shaping the new image of Enoch as the supreme angel elevated above the angelic world. The role of Enoch as the king/manager of earth in *2 Enoch* is, therefore, directly connected with the later Metatron title, the «Prince of the World», found in the Merkabah literature and on the incantation bowls from Babylonia. Cf. Alexander, 3 Enoch… 229, 243; C. H. Gordon, Aramaic and Mandaic Magical Bowls // *ArOr* 9 (1937) 94–95. The Merkabah tradition stresses the role of Enoch-Metatron as the governing power over the nations, kingdoms, and rulers on earth. Chapter 30 of *3 Enoch* alludes to the role of Metatron as the Prince of the World, the leader of seventy-two princes of kingdoms in the world who speaks (pleads) in favor of the world before the Holy One... every day at the hour when the book is opened in which every deed in the world is recorded. The depiction of Metatron as the «Prince of the World» in *3 Enoch* reveals several similarities to the royal status of Enoch in the Slavonic apocalypse. One of them is that in *2 Enoch* 64:1 the patriarch delivers his address «to his sons and to *the princes of the people*». The reference to the princes of the people is intriguing since in *3 Enoch* 30 Metatron is described as the leader of seventy-two *princes* of the kingdoms of the world. The second important similarity is that in both texts the role of Enoch/Metatron as the governing power on earth is tied to his duties as the witness of the divine judgment. Both accounts, therefore, contain references to Enoch's writings representing the record of all the deeds of every person.

dental that in this situation some duties of Adam in his office of the king of the earth become also transferred to the new occupant of this office, the seventh antediluvian patriarch. In chapters 39 and 43, Enoch's introductions as the king and the manager of the earth are followed with lengthy accounts of Enoch's activities involving measuring everything on earth. Right after Enoch is defined as the earthly king in *2 Enoch* 39, the patriarch tells his children:

> ...And everything that is nourished on the earth I have investigated and written down, and every seed, sown and not sown, which grows from earth, and all the garden plants, and all the grasses, and all the flowers, and their delightful fragrances and their names... I measured all the earth, and its mountains and hills and fields and woods and stones and rivers, and everything that exist... [35]

It appears that the functions of Enoch in his role as the king/manager of the earth include, just as in the role of Adam, the duty registering the created order. Like Adam who «named» everything that lives on the earth Enoch in his turn writes down «every seed on the earth». [36]

It is important that Enoch's «stewardship» over the created order, akin to Adam's duties, also includes the obligation to protect and care for the animals. In *2 Enoch* 58–59, the protoplast's responsibilities pertaining to the animals are transferred to the seventh antediluvian patriarch and his descendants.

It is noteworthy that both accounts, the story of Adam's naming of animals and Enoch's instructions to his children about the protection of animals, are located in the same chapter of the Slavonic apocalypse. *2 Enoch* 58 depicts the Lord summoning all creatures of the earth and bringing them before Adam that the first human might name them. This story then continues with Enoch's instructions to his children about the special care for animals whose souls will testify against human beings at the great judgment if they treat them unjustly. This account, which substitutes one steward of God's earthly creatures for another, fits perfectly into the pattern of the Adamic polemics found in the Slavonic apocalypse.

In *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult,* C. Böttrich drew attention to the patriarch's designation as the earthly king.[37] Unfortunately, he failed to recognize the polemical meaning of this royal title in the original argument of the Slavonic apocalypse and dismissed it as a later interpolation. Böttrich's

[35] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 164–166. In chapter 43, the same picture can be observed. Enoch's measuring activities follow his definition as the governor/manager of the earth.

[36] It should be noted that this role of Enoch as the measurer of *the earthly things* is not fully developed yet in the early Enochic booklets of *1 Enoch* where Enoch's functions as the heavenly scribe are limited to the meteorological, calendarical and astronomical matters.

[37] C. Böttrich, Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch (Tübingen, 1992) (WUNT, 2/50) 113–114.

attempt to illuminate the origins of Enoch's royal imagery through the reference to the late rabbinic text *Hayye Hanokh* from *Sefer haYashar* is problematic.[38] In light of our hypothesis about the Adamic provenance of Enoch's royal title in the Slavonic apocalypse, such dubious associations are not necessary.

Angelic Veneration

It is difficult to overestimate the value for our discussion of an article published by Michael Stone in 1993.[39] M. Stone's illuminating study reveals that the argument with the Adamic tradition in the Slavonic apocalypse includes, not only the internal debates based on *2 Enoch's* depictions of the protoplast, but also the intertextual polemics with the Adamic traditions attested in the primary Adam books.[40] The fact that these Adamic traditions are already re-written in the Slavonic apocalypse, as the deeds and functions of the protoplast are transferred to Enoch without any reference to their original «proprietor», serves as strong evidence to the scope of the polemical intentions of *2 Enoch*'s authors.

M. Stone's article investigates an important motif preserved in chapters 21–22 of the Slavonic apocalypse. The story depicts angels bringing Enoch to the edge of the seventh heaven. By the Lord's command, the archangel Gabriel invites the patriarch to stand in front of the Lord forever. Enoch agrees and archangel Gabriel carries him to the «Face» of the Lord where the patriarch does obeisance to God. God then personally repeats the invitation to Enoch to stand before him forever. After this invitation, archangel Michael brings the patriarch to *the front* of the face of the Lord. The Lord then tells his angels, sounding them out: «Let Enoch join in and stand in front of my face forever!» In response to this address, the Lord's glorious ones do obeisance to Enoch saying, «Let Enoch yield in accordance with your word, O Lord!»[41] After that the patriarch's earthly garments were removed by archangel Michael, he was anointed with shining oil and became like one of the glorious ones.[42]

M. Stone observes that the story found in *2 Enoch* 21–22 recalls the account of Adam's elevation and his veneration by angels found in Armenian,

[38] Ibid. 113. Cf. also, C. Böttrich, Beobachtungen zum Midrash vom «Leben Henochs» // *Mitteilungen und Beiträge der Forschungsstelle Judentum an der Theologischen Fakultät Leipzig* 10 (1996) 44–83.

[39] M. E. Stone, The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve* // *JTS* 44 (1993) 143–156.

[40] This does not mean that *2 Enoch* is literally dependent on the primary Adam books in their final form, but rather indicates that the traditions which stand behind these books have ancient origins since, by the first century CE, these traditions were already appropriated into the Enochic text.

[41] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 138.

[42] Ibid.

Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve*.[43] These versions depict God's creation of Adam in his image. Archangel Michael brought the first human and had him bow down before God's face. God then commanded all the angels to bow down to Adam. All the angels agreed to venerate the protoplast except Satan (and his angels) who refused to bow down before Adam, because the first human was «younger» than («posterior» to) Satan.

M. Stone notes that, aside from the motifs of Adam's elevation and his veneration by angels, the author of *2 Enoch* appears to be also aware of the motif of angelic disobedience and refusal to venerate the first human. M. Stone draws the reader's attention to the phrase «sounding them out», found in *2 Enoch* 22:6, which another translator of the Slavonic text rendered as «making a trial of them».[44] M. Stone rightly notes that the expressions «sounding them out» or «making a trial of them» imply here that it is the angels' obedience that is being tested.[45]

Comparing the similarities between Adamic and Enochic accounts, M. Stone observes that the order of events in *2 Enoch* exactly duplicates the order found in the primary Adam books since both sources know three chief events:[46]

I. *LAE:* Adam is created and situated in heaven.
2 Enoch: Enoch is brought to heaven.

II. *LAE*: Archangel Michael brings Adam before God's face. Adam does obeisance to God.
2 Enoch: Archangel Michael brings Enoch before the Lord's Face. Enoch does obeisance to the Lord.

III. *LAE*: God commands the angels to bow down. All the angels do obeisance. Satan and his angels disobey.
2 Enoch: «The rebellion in the Adam events is assumed. God tests whether this time the angels will obey. The angels are said to bow down and accept God's command».[47]

---

[43] The Adamic story of the angelic veneration of Adam and Satan's disobedience is attested in many Jewish, Christian and Muslim materials. Cf. Slavonic version of *3 Baruch* 4; *Gos. Bart.* 4, Coptic *Enthronement of Michael*, *Cave of Treasures* 2:10–24; *Qur'an* 2:31–39; 7:11–18; 15:31–48; 17:61–65; 18:50; 20:116–123; 38:71–85.

[44] W. R. Morfill, R. H. Charles, The Book of the Secrets of Enoch (Oxford, 1896) 28.

[45] M. E. Stone, The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve* // Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays / Ed. G. Anderson, M. Stone, J. Tromp (Leiden, 2000) (SVTP, 15) 47.

[46] Stone, The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance… 48.

[47] Ibid.

M. Stone concludes that the author of *2 Enoch* 21–22 was cognizant of the traditions resembling[48] those found in Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve*.[49] He also stresses that these traditions did not enter *2 Enoch* from the Slavonic *Life of Adam and Eve*, because this form of tradition does not occur in the Slavonic recension of the primary Adam book.[50]

It appears that the Adamic tradition from chapter 22 is not an interpolation, but belongs to the original core of the Slavonic apocalypse. Two significant features found in *2 Enoch* seem to indicate that the tradition of angelic veneration is interwoven into the original fabric of the text. The first is evidenced in chapter 7 of the Slavonic apocalypse. *2 Enoch* 7:3 depicts Enoch carried by angels to the second heaven. There the patriarch sees the condemned angels kept as prisoners awaiting the «measureless judgment». Enoch's angelic guides explain to him that the prisoners are «those who turned away from the Lord, who did not obey the Lord's commandments, but of their own will plotted together and turned away with their prince and with those who are under restraint in the fifth heaven».[51] The story further continues with angelic veneration: the condemned angels bow down to Enoch asking for his intercession: «Man of God, pray for us to the Lord!»[52]

It is possible that this passage about the group of the condemned angels is an allusion to the motif of angelic veneration found in *2 Enoch* 22 and in the primary Adam books.

Three details of the story from *2 Enoch* 7 seem to support this interpretation:

a. In *2 Enoch* 7, just as in the Adamic accounts, the sin of the imprisoned angels is *disobedience* to the Lord's commandments.

b. The agents of the rebellion are a *group of angels* with «*their prince*». This recalls the information found in the Adamic accounts where not only Satan, but also other angels under him, refuse to venerate Adam. The longer recension of *2 Enoch* 18:3 directly identifies the prisoners of the second heaven as the angels of Satanail.[53]

---

[48] M. Stone's argument was later supported and developed by G. Anderson. G. Anderson observes that «one cannot imagine that the tradition in the Enoch materials was created independently from the tradition found in the *Vita*». G. Anderson, The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan // Literature on Adam and Eve… 101.

[49] Stone, The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance… 48.

[50] Ibid.

[51] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 114.

[52] Ibid.

[53] *2 Enoch* 18:3 «And those men answered me, "These are the Grigori, who turned aside from the Lord, 200 myriads, together with their prince Satanail. And similar to them are those who went down as prisoners in their train, who are in the second

c. The imprisoned angels *bow down* before man (Enoch). An additional important detail here is that the patriarch is addressed by the fallen angels as a «man» — «a man of God».

This act of angelic bowing before Enoch in the second heaven might anticipate later angelic obeisance the patriarch received in chapter 22 of the Slavonic apocalypse.

The second evidence demonstrating that the theme of angelic bowing from chapter 22 is deeply imbedded in the original theological framework of the Enochic writing is its connection with the Enochic title «Youth» or «Lad» found in some Slavonic MSS of *2 Enoch*.

Youth

We have already seen that the authors of *2 Enoch* are responsible for creating the new roles and titles of Enoch which are absent in the early Enochic treatises of *1 Ethiopic Enoch* but can be found in the later Merkabah mysticism. One of such titles is «Youth» which becomes one of the favorite designations of Metatron in the Merkabah literature.

Before proceeding to the analysis of the title «Youth» in the Slavonic text and its connection with the Adamic tradition, a short excursus into the later rabbinic materials is necessary.

Recently Gary Anderson demonstrated that the Adamic story of angelic veneration and opposition to humanity played a prominent role in rabbinic literature.[54] In his article Anderson draws attention to the account found in *3 Enoch* 4 where the Adamic motif of angelic veneration, in a manner similar to *2 Enoch* 22, was applied to Enoch-Metatron.

---

heaven, imprisoned in great darkness"». Andersen, 2 Enoch… 130. It is noteworthy that in *2 Enoch* the Enochic story of the Watchers' rebellion and the Adamic story of Satan's refusal to venerate humanity appear to be closely connected. They demonstrate an intriguing parallel to the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* 2, *3 Enoch* 5:9–10 and the *Zohar* III.207b–208a, where the leaders of the Watchers are depicted as the forces opposing the creation and elevation of humanity.

[54] Anderson, The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan… 83–110. On the Adamic traditions in rabbinic literature see, also: A. Altmann, The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends // *JQR* 35 (1945) 371–391; B. Barc, La taille cosmique d'Adam dans la littérature juive rabbinique des trois premiers siècles après J.-C. // *RSR* 48 (1975) 173–185; J. Fossum, The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis // Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag. 2 vols. / Ed. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, P. Schäfer (Tübingen, 1996) Vol. 1. 529–539; P. Schäfer, Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorstellung (Berlin, 1975) (SJ, 8); A. Segal, Two Powers in Heaven. Early Rabinnic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism (Leiden, 1977) (SJLA, 25) 108–115.

3 Enoch 4:1–10 depicts Rabbi Ishmael questioning his celestial guide Metatron about his name «Youth». The passage reads:

> R. Ishmael said: I said to Metatron: «...you are greater than all the princes, more exalted than all the angels, more beloved than all the ministers... why, then, do they call you "Youth" in the heavenly heights?» He answered: «Because I am Enoch, the son of Jared... the Holy One, blessed be he, appointed me in the height as a prince and a ruler among the ministering angels. Then three of ministering angels, Uzzah, Azzah, and Azael, came and laid charges against me in the heavenly height. They said before the Holy One, blessed be He, « Lord of the Universe, did not the primeval ones give you good advice when they said, Do not create man!»[55] ...And once they all arose and went to meet me and prostrated themselves before me, saying «Happy are you, and happy your parents, because your Creator has favored you. Because I am young in their company and mere youth among them in days and months and years — herefore they call me "Youth"».[56]

Commenting on this passage, G. Anderson suggests that if «we remove those layers of the tradition that are clearly secondary ... we are left with a story that is almost identical to the analog we have traced in the Adam and Eve literature and II Enoch».[57] He further notes that the acclamation of Enoch as «Youth» in *Sefer Hekhalot* is intriguing since the reason *3 Enoch* supplies for this title is deceptively simple and straightforward: «Because I am young in their company and a mere youth among them in days and months and years — therefore they call me "Youth"». G. Anderson proposes that the title might have Adamic origins since the explanation for the epithet «youth» recalls the reason for the angelic refusal to worship Adam in the *Vita* on the basis of his inferiority to them by way of his age.[58]

G. Anderson's hypothesis that the origin of the title «Youth» is connected with the appropriation of the Adamic tradition is crucial to the current investigation.

It is interesting that in some manuscripts of the Slavonic Enoch the seventh antediluvian patriarch is also often addressed as «youth».[59] Despite the fact that this designation occurs only in several Slavonic manuscripts, the author of the recent English translation, Francis Andersen, considered this reading as the original.[60] He was also the first scholar to propose that Enoch's

---

[55] For the similar tradition see: the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* 2, and the *Zohar* III.207b–208a.

[56] Alexander, 3 Enoch... 258–259.

[57] Anderson, The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan... 107.

[58] Ibid. 108.

[59] Slav. **юношє**.

[60] Professor Francis Andersen reassured me in a private communication about the originality of this reading, referring to it as «powerful evidence».

designation as «Youth» in *2 Enoch* recalls the identical title of Metatron attested in *3 Enoch* and other Hekhaloth writings.[61] In his commentary to the English translation of *2 Enoch* in OTP, Andersen wrote:

> The remarkable reading *yunoše* [youth], clearly legible in A, supports the evidence of V, which has this variant four times (not here), and of other MSS, that there was a tradition in which Enoch was addressed in this way. The similarity to the vocative *enoše* [Enoch] might explain the variant as a purely scribal slip. But it is surprising that it is only in address, never in description, that the term is used. The variant *jenokhu* is rare. There is no phonetic reason why the first vowel should change to *ju*; *junokhu* is never found. But it cannot be a coincidence that this title is identical with that of Enoch (= Metatron) in *3 Enoch*.[62]

It is notable that several important occurrences of the title «Youth» in *2 Enoch* come from the mouth of angels. Thus in chapter 9 of the shorter recension, an angelic being accompanying Enoch on his way through the heavenly realm addresses him as «youth»: «This place has been prepared, Youth, for the righteous...».[63] Later in chapter 10, one can hear the same address again: «this place, Youth, has been prepared for those who practice godless uncleanness on the earth...».[64] These angelic addresses are consistent with the Adamic and Merkabah accounts in which angelic beings point to Adam/Enoch's young age.

According to the Merkabah tradition, God also likes to address Enoch-Metatron as «Youth». In *3 Enoch* 3, when R. Ishmael asks Metatron «What is your name?» Metatron answers, «I have seventy names, corresponding to the seventy nations of the world ... however, my King calls me "Youth"».[65] The designation of Enoch as «Youth» seems to signify here the special relationship between the Holy One and Metatron. One can see the beginning of this tradition already in *2 Enoch* where in chapter 24 of the shorter recension the following tradition can be found:

> And the Lord called me (Enoch) and he placed me to himself closer than Gabriel. And I did obeisance to the Lord. And the Lord spoke to me «Whatever you see, Youth, things standing still and moving about were brought

[61] See, for example, *Synopse,* §§ 384; 385; 390; 396. P. Schäfer, with M. Schlüter and H. G. von Mutius, Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur (Tübingen, 1981) (TSAJ, 2) 162–163, 164–165, 166–167.

[62] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 118–119.

[63] Соколов, Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе... 85.

[64] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 119.

[65] Alexander, 3 Enoch... 257.

> to perfection by me. and not even to angels have I explained my secrets... as I am making them known to you today...».[66]

It is significant that the title «youth» here is tied to the motif of human superiority over angels, which plays a prominent role in the primary Adam books where God orders his angels to bow down before humanity.

Finally, we must note that several important readings of «youth» in the materials associated with the Slavonic Enoch can be found in the Vienna Codex.[67] In this manuscript Enoch is addressed by the Lord as «youth»[68] in the context of angelic veneration:

> And the Lord with his own mouth called me [Enoch] and said: Be brave, Youth![69] Do not be frightened! Stand up in front of my face forever. And Michael, the Lord's *archistratig*, brought me in the front of the Lord's face. And the Lord tempted his servants and said to them: «Let Enoch come up and stand in the front of my face forever». And the glorious ones bowed down and said: «Let him come up!»[70]

In conclusion, it should be noticed that our analysis revealed that several important readings pertaining to the Adamic polemics can be found in the manuscripts of the shorter recension. It does not follow, however, that these readings are secondary and not original. The rehabilitation of the longer recension, as well as the reaffirmation of its value in recent scholarship, should not lead to the automatic rejection of everything in the shorter recension as inauthentic and secondary. The mere subscription to one of the recensions deceptively oversimplifies the problem of asserting the original text. The task is more complicated and necessarily involves a careful investigation of the theological intentions of the authors and editors of the text. Almost three decades ago F. Andersen warned students of *2 Enoch* against jumping to simplistic and hasty conclusions. He noted that «all of the materials calls for reassessment… In the present state of our knowledge, the genuineness of any disputed passage is difficult to judge».[71] His prudent advice still remains valuable today.

---

[66] Соколов, Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе… 90–91; Andersen, 2 Enoch… 119.

[67] I want to express my deep appreciation to Professor Francis Andersen who generously shared with me the microfilms and photographs of MSS V, R, and J.

[68] Unfortunately, Friedrich Repp's research on the Vienna Codex failed to discern the proper meaning of «youth» in this important manuscript. See: F. Repp, Textkritische Untersuchungen zum Henoch-Apokryph des co. slav. 125 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek // *Wiener slavistische Jahrbuch* 10 (1963) 65.

[69] Slav. **юноше**.

[70] Ms. V (VL 125) [Nr. 3], fol. 317.

[71] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 93–94.

The Hunger Motif

The previous analysis demonstrated that the author(s) of the Slavonic apocalypse were cognizant of the motifs and themes similar to those found in the primary Adam books. One of the prominent Adamic motifs absent in the Biblical account but present in the later extrabiblical traditions is the theme of Adam and Eve's hunger after their eviction from Eden to earth.[72]

The primary Adam books begin their stories with depicting the expulsion of the first humans from the Garden. The narrative continues with describing the hunger the first humans experienced as they found themselves on earth. It seems that the cause of their hunger was not the absence of food on earth, but the dining habits of the first humans, who were used to the celestial nourishment during their stay in Paradise. It is, therefore, significant that the Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the primary Adam books emphasize the difference between the two foods: the angelic food which Adam and Eve ate in the paradise and the food that lies before them on the earth.[73]

In *2 Enoch* the story of the first humans' hunger takes a new polemical form. The second part of *2 Enoch* depicts the patriarch who, just like Adam and Eve, was transported from heaven to earth. This time, however, the transition is pleasant: Enoch is not punitively expelled from heaven, like Adam, but sent by God on a short trip to instruct his children. From *2 Enoch* 56:2 we learn that during Enoch's instructions, Methuselah asks his father a blessing, so that he may prepare some food for him to eat. The patriarch answers his son in the following manner:

> Listen, child! Since the time when the Lord anointed me with the ointment of his glory, food has not come into me, and *earthly* pleasure my soul does not remember, nor do I desire anything earthly (*2 Enoch* 56:2 the longer recension).

In the shorter recension of *2 Enoch*, the patriarch's rejection of food is even more decisive:

> Listen my child! Since the time when the Lord anointed me with ointment of my glory, it has been horrible for me, and food is not agreeable to me, and I have no desire for earthly food.[74]

---

[72] On the hunger motif in the primary Adam books, see: G. Anderson, The Penitence Narrative in the Life of Adam and Eve // Literature on Adam and Eve… 6ff.

[73] «They arose and went about upon the earth, and they did not find food like the food by which they had been nourished in [the Garden]». A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve. Second Revised Edition / Ed. G. A. Anderson, M. E. Stone (Atlanta, 1999) (EJL, 17) 3E.

[74] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 183.

The important detail that connects this Enochic account to the account found in the Armenian, Georgian, and Latin primary Adam books is their emphasis on the fact that it is the earthly food that is unsuitable for those who just came from the celestial realm. The account found in these versions of the primary Adam books also stresses this fact. They inform that Adam and Eve «did not find food like the food by which they had been nourished in the Garden». Eve's discourse found in 4:2 again emphasizes this difference between earthly and celestial food, referring to earthly food as nourishment for the beasts.[75]

These similarities suggest that the tradition found in *2 Enoch* 56:2 might represent a part of the polemics with the Adamic traditions in the Slavonic apocalypse. Here Enoch is depicted as superior to Adam and Eve, who must accept the earthly food as the sign of the Fall and their permanent transition to the lower realm.

It should be also noted that it is unlikely that this tradition entered *2 Enoch* from the Slavonic *Life of Adam and Eve*, since the Slavonic *Vita* does not attest to the traditions about earthly and celestial food.

The Motif of the Divine Face

Our previous investigation of the motif of angelic veneration showed that one of the concentrated elaborations of Adamic polemics in *2 Enoch* is found in chapter 22, which depicts the climax of Enoch's celestial trip and his luminous metamorphosis near the Throne of Glory. The partiarch's transition to the new, celestial identity found in this part of the text is therefore convenient for appropriating the Adamic tradition about the luminous condition of the protoplast.

The motif of the divine Face is important to linking Enoch's glorious condition with the former luminosity of Adam. Enoch's luminous metamorphosis takes its place in front of the Lord's glorious «extent», labeled in *2 Enoch* 22 and 39 as the Lord's «Face».[76] From *2 Enoch* 22 we learn that the vision of

[75] A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve… 5E.

[76] «I saw the view of the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot in a fire and brought out, and it emits sparks and is incandescent. Thus even I saw the face of the Lord. But the face of the Lord is not to be talked about, it is so very marvelous and supremely awesome and supremely frightening. And who am I to give an account of the incomprehensible being of the Lord, and of his face, so extremely strange and indescribable? And how many are his commands, and his multiple voice, and the Lord's throne, supremely great and not made by hands, and the choir stalls all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, and their never-silent singing. Who can give an account of his beautiful appearance, never changing and indescribable, and his great glory? And I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord» (*2 Enoch* 22:1–4, the longer recension). Andersen, 2 Enoch… 136.

the divine «Face» had dramatic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endured radical changes as it became covered with the divine light. This encounter transformed Enoch into a glorious angelic being. The text says that after this procedure Enoch became like one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference.[77] This phrase describes Enoch's transition to his new celestial identity as «one of the glorious ones». During this transition in front of the Lord's face, Enoch's own «face» became radically altered and the patriarch acquired a new glorious «visage» which reflected the luminosity[78] of the Lord's *Panim*.[79] The important link that connects this new condition of Enoch with the condition of the glorious Adam is the theme of the new creation after the Lord's Face. It has been shown that the Face in *2 Enoch* 22 represented the cause and the prototype after which the new celestial identity of Enoch was *formed*. The new creation after the Face signifies here the return to the prelapsarian condition of Adam, who also was «modeled» after the Face of God. Support for this view can be found in *2 Enoch* 44:1 where one learns that the protoplast was also created after the Face of God. The text says that «the Lord with his own two hands created mankind; in a facsimile of his own face, both small and great, the Lord created [them]».[80] It is intriguing that *2 Enoch* departs here from the canonical

[77] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 139.

[78] *2 Enoch's* narrative gives evidence that Enoch's face acquired the same qualities of luminosity as the Face of the Lord. In *2 Enoch* 37, the Lord calls one of his angels to chill the face of Enoch before his return to earth. The angel, who «appeared frozen», then chilled Enoch's face with his icy hands. Immediately after this procedure, the Lord tells Enoch that if his face had not been chilled in such a way, no human being would be able to look at his face. This chilling procedure indicates that Enoch's metamorphosis near the Face involves the transformation of the visionary's face into the fiery, perilous entity which now resembles the Lord's Face. We can find a detailed description of this process in another «Enochic» text, *Sefer Hekhalot*, which describes the transformation of Enoch-Metatron, the Prince of the Divine Presence, into a fiery creature. Cf. *3 Enoch* 15:1 «R. Ishmael said: The angel Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, the glory of highest heaven, said to me: When the Holy One, blessed be he, took me to serve the throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all needs of the Shekinah, at once my flesh turned to flame, my sinews to blazing fire, my bones to juniper coals, my eyelashes to lightning flashes, my eyeballs to fiery torches, the hairs of my head to hot flames, all my limbs to wings of burning fire, and the substance of my body to blazing fire». *3 Enoch* 15:1. Alexander, 3 Enoch... 267.

[79] It is noteworthy that after this procedure Enoch's «face», just as the Lord's face acquired the ability to glorify other subjects. Thus in *2 Enoch* 64:3–5 the following tradition can be found: «...and the elders of the people and all the community came and prostrated themselves and kissed Enoch... O our father Enoch, bless your sons and all the people, so that we may be glorified in front of your face today». Andersen, 2 Enoch... 190.

[80] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 170.

reading attested in Gen 1:26–27 where Adam was created, not after the face of God, but after His image (*tselem*). F. Andersen observes that *2 Enoch's* «idea is remarkable from any point of view... This is not the original meaning of *tselem*... The text uses *podobie lica* [in the likeness of the face], not *obrazu* or *videnije*, the usual terms for «image».[81]

It is clear, however, that this reading did not arise in the Slavonic environment, but belonged to the original argument of *2 Enoch* where the creation of the luminous protoplast after the Face of the Lord corresponds to a similar angelic «creation» of the seventh antediluvian patriarch. There is almost no doubt that, in the view of the information about Adam's glorious angelic nature attested in *2 Enoch* 30:11, the author of the Slavonic apocalypse tries to connect the theme of Adam's creation with the motif of the glorious Face of the Lord.

Regrettably, Böttrich did not recognize the pivotal role of the imagery of the divine Face in the original argument of the Slavonic apocalypse and rejected the descriptions of the Lord's Face in *2 Enoch* 22 and 39 as later interpolations.[82] This rejection had, in my judgment, dramatic consequences for Böttrich's research and his ability to discern the theology of the text in general and the meaning of the Adamic traditions in *2 Enoch* in particular. The tradition of the Divine Face represents a nexus through which several significant polemical trajectories of the text are interwoven together. One of these trajectories is the connection between the traditions of Adam's cosmic body in *2 Enoch* 30:8–11 and the *Shiʿur Qomah* tradition presented in *2 Enoch* 39, which depicts Enoch as the measurer of the divine body.[83] This important connection completely escaped Böttrich's attention and undermined the credibility of his later research on the cosmic body of Adam.[84]

Oil from the Tree of Life

Another Adamic motif in the story of Enoch's transformation is the luminous oil, which causes the patriarch's glorious metamorphosis. *2 Enoch* 22:9 portrays archangel Michael extracting Enoch from his clothes and anointing him with delightful oil. The text tells that the oil's appearance was «greater than the greatest light and its ointment is like sweet dew, and the fragrance

[81] Ibid. 171, note b.

[82] See: Böttrich, Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult… 112–113.

[83] G. Scholem was the first to propose that the expression «the extent of the Lord» found in *2 Enoch* 39 might reflect the exact terminology found in the *Shiʿur Qomah* materials. Cf. Scholem's lecture The Age of *Shiʿur Qomah* Speculation and a Passage in Origen // G. Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition (New York, 1965); idem, On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in the Kabbalah (New York, 1991) 29.

[84] C. Böttrich, Adam als Microkosmos (Berlin, 1995) (Judentum und Umwelt, 59).

[like] myrrh; and it is like rays of the glittering sun».[85] The anointing with the oil causes the patriarch's transformation from the garments of skin to the luminous garment of an immortal angelic being, one of the glorious ones.

It appears that that the oil used in Enoch's anointing comes from the Tree of Life, which in *2 Enoch* 8:3–4 is depicted with a similar symbolism. *2 Enoch* 8:3–4 tells that «...the tree [of life] is indescribable for pleasantness and fine fragrance, and more beautiful than any (other) created thing that exists. And from every direction it has an appearance which is gold-looking and crimson, and with the form of fire».[86] The shorter recension also refers to a second, olive tree near the first one «flowing with oil continually».[87]

It should be noted that the oil anointing of Enoch is a unique motif in the Enochic tradition. Enoch's approach to the throne in the *Book of the Watchers* and his transformation into the Son of Man in the *Book of the Similitudes* do not involve anointing with or any usage of oil. Later «Enochic» traditions are also silent about oil. For example, the account of Metatron's transformation in *3 Enoch* does not mention any anointing with oil.

Yet while unknown in the Enochic literature, the motif of anointing with the oil from the Tree of Life looms large in the Adamic tradition. Chapter 35(9) of the primary Adam books contains the story of Adam's sickness. The patriarch finds himself in great distress and pain. Trying to find a cure, Adam sends Eve and Seth to paradise so they can bring the oil of the Tree of Life that will relieve his illness. Their mission, however, is unsuccessful. Archangel Michael refuses to give the oil to Eve and Seth, telling them that the oil will be used «when the years of the end are filled completely» for those who «be worthy of entering the Garden».[88]

There are several corresponding characteristics that can be detected in the Adamic and Enochic accounts:

1. The purpose of the anointing is similar in both traditions. Its function is the «resurrection of Adam's body»[89] e.g., the reversal of the earthly fallen condition into the incorruptible luminous state of the protoplast. It is not coincidental that in *2 Enoch* 22 oil anointing transforms Enoch into a luminous angelic being. As has been already noted, it recalls the description of the protoplast in *2 Enoch* 30:11 as a glorious angelic being.

2. The subject of the anointing is also identical. In *2 Enoch* and in the primary Adam books, the oil is used (or will be used) for transforming the righteous ones in their transition to the angelic state in the celestial realm. In

[85] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 138.

[86] Ibid. 114.

[87] Ibid. 117.

[88] A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve... 45E (Armenian version).

[89] Ibid.

the primary Adam books, the oil is prepared for those who «be worthy of *entering the Garden*».[90] M. Stone observes that *2 Enoch* also «knows an anointing with the heavenly perfumed oil that brings about a transformation of the righteous».[91]

The same situation is also attested in *3 Baruch*, where the reward of the righteous is oil. H. Gaylord notes that this theme in *3 Baruch* has a connection with the Adamic tradition. He observes that «by his disobedience Adam lost "the glory of God" (4:16[G]), which may have been comparable to that of angels (cf. 13:4[S]). The reward of the righteous is oil, possibly the sign of the glory of God, which the angel-guide promises to show Baruch several times in this text (6:12; 7:2; 11:2; 16:3[S]). It is hardly accidental that there are traditions that Adam sought to receive the "oil of mercy" at the point of death, and that Enoch was transformed by the "oil of his glory"...».[92]

3. It is important that in *2 Enoch* and in the primary Adam books a person in charge of oil is the archangel Michael.[93] In *2 Enoch* 22 he anoints Enoch with shining oil causing his luminous metamorphosis. In *3 Baruch* 15:1 Michael brings oil to the righteous.[94] In the primary Adam books he also seems to be in charge of oil since it is he who declines giving Seth the oil for healing Adam.

4. It is intriguing that *2 Enoch* and the primary Adam accounts refer to the *flowing* of the oil. Thus, the Georgian *LAE* 36(9):4 relates that «...(God) will send his angel to the Garden where the Tree of Life is, from which the oil flows out, so that he may give you a little of that oil».[95] *2 Enoch* 8:5 seems to attest to the same tradition: «and another tree is near it, an olive, flowing with oil continually». M. Stone notes that «it is striking that *2 Enoch* highlights the flowing of the oil, just like the Adam books».[96]

These similarities show that the motif of the oil from the Tree of Life in *2 Enoch* might have Adamic provenance. It is unlikely that this tradition is a later interpolation. Attested in both recensions, it plays a pivotal role in the scene of Enoch's luminous metamorphosis.

---

[90] 43 (13): «The Lord said, "I will admit them into the Garden and I will anoint them with that unction"». A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve… 45E (Georgian version).

[91] M. Stone, The Angelic Prediction in the Primary Adam Books // Literature on Adam and Eve… 127.

[92] H. E. Gaylord, 3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch // OTP. Vol. 1. 658.

[93] Cf. Stone, The Angelic Prediction in the Primary Adam Books… 126.

[94] E. C. Quinn, The Quest of Seth for the Oil of Life (Chicago, 1962) 59.

[95] A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve… 40E.

[96] Stone, The Angelic Prediction in the Primary Adam Books… 126.

«The One Who Carried Away the Sin of Humankind»

It has been mentioned earlier that in later Jewish mysticism Metatron was viewed as a divine being first incarnated in Adam and then in Enoch, who re-ascended to the protoplast's heavenly home and took his rightful place in the heights of the universe. P. Alexander observes that «Enoch thus becomes a redeemer figure — a second Adam through whom humanity is restored».[97] It appears that this theological motif of Enoch's redeeming role is already developed in *2 Enoch*.

In chapter 64 of the longer recension of the Slavonic apocalypse, the «astounding encomium» can be found which, in the view of one of *2 Enoch's* translators, «could hardly please a Christian or a Jew».[98] The chapter depicts a prostration of «the elders of the people» and «all the community» before Enoch at the place of his second departure to heaven. The people who came to bow down before the patriarch delivered to Enoch the following address:

> O our father,[99] Enoch! May you be blessed by the Lord, the eternal king! And now, bless your [sons], and all the people, so that we may be glorified in front of your face today. For you will be glorified in front of the face [of the Lord for eternity], because you are the one whom the Lord *chose in preference to all the people upon the earth*; and he appointed you to be the one who makes a written record of all his creation, visible and invisible, and *the one who carried away the sin of mankind* (*2 Enoch* 64:4–5).[100]

An important detail in this address is Enoch's designation as «the one who *carried away* the sin of [hu]mankind». This depiction of the patriarch as a redeemer is intriguing. But what kind of sin was Enoch able to carry away?

Böttrich argues that the description of Enoch as the one who carried away the sins of humankind reflects not the reality but only the expectation of the «elders of the people». He stresses that *2 Enoch* absolutely rejects the idea of intercession before God,[101] pointing to the passage in chapter 53 where the patriarch warns his children that he will not be able to help them on the day of judgment, since no one can help relieve another person's sin.[102]

---

[97] Alexander, From Son of Adam to a Second God… 111.

[98] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 190.

[99] The designation of Enoch as «our father» here and in *2 Enoch* 69:2, 69:5, 70:3 might have a polemical flavor. In *2 Enoch* 58:1 Adam is also designated as «our father». In *WisSol* 10:1 the title «the Father of the World» is applied to the protoplast. See, P. B. Munoa III, Four Powers in Heaven. The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham (Sheffield, 1998) (JSPSS, 28) 104–105.

[100] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 190.

[101] Böttrich, Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult… 194–195. Böttrich, The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reaction to A. Orlov… 457.

[102] *2 Enoch* 53:1–4. See also 7:4–5, 62:2.

Unfortunately, Böttrich's observations, based on a faulty methodology, miss the gist of the argument in chapter 64. Oblivious to Adamic polemics in the text, he fails to notice a crucial detail: in *2 Enoch* 64 the «elders of the earth» define Enoch not as the one who will carry away the sin of humankind, but as the one who already carried away this sin.[103] The emphasis on the already accomplished redemptive act provides an important clue to understanding the kind of sin Enoch was able to erase. The focus here is not on the individual sins of Enoch's descendents, but on the primeval sin of humankind.[104] Therefore, it becomes apparent that the redeeming functions of the patriarch are not related to his possible intercession for the sins of his children, the fallen angels or the «elders of the earth», as Böttrich suggested. Rather they pertain to the sin of the protoplast which the patriarch was able to «carry away» by his righteousness, ascension, and transformation. Accordingly, Enoch has already accomplished his role as the «redeemer» of humanity through his luminous metamorphosis near the throne of glory.[105] Humanity has been redeemed in him, and this redemption gives hope to other righteous ones, who will later attain the paradisal condition. The significant detail that confirms Enoch's unique redeeming role is that, unlike in chapter 53 where he opposes the idea of intercession, in *2 Enoch* 64–65 he does not object to the idea that he is able to carry away the sin of humankind.

Enoch's response to the people's address, which occupies the following chapter 65, provides additional support for interpreting the sin Enoch was able to carry away as related to the transgression of the protoplast. It is not coincidental that the patriarch starts his response with paraphrasing the account of Adam's creation, telling that the Lord «constituted man in his own form, in accordance with a similarity».[106] He further relates that the Lord gave the protoplast «eyes to see, and ears to hear, and heart to think, and reason to argue».[107] Some elements of this part of the paraphrase allude to the

[103] Slav. **ѿимитель** — literally «the one who has taken away». Соколов, Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе… 1.59; 1.101. The noun **ѿимитель** derives from the verb **отъмати**, **отимати** (to remove, to release) which among other meanings can be used in the expression «to release from sin». Barhudarov's dictionary relates **отимати** to the Greek ἀφαιρεῖν. Словарь русского языка XI–XVII веков / Изд. С. Г. Бархударов. 25 тт. (Москва, 1975–) Т. 14. 74–75.

[104] Another important hint that Enoch was able to take away the sin of the protoplast is that the MSS of the longer recension speak, not about many sins, but about only one sin, «the *sin* of *[hu]mankind*». In contrast, the reading of the shorter recension, which uses a plural form — «our sins», is clearly secondary.

[105] The important hint to this unique role is Enoch's definition in *2 Enoch* 64 as «the one whom the Lord chose in preference to all the people of the earth».

[106] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 190.

[107] Ibid.

details of the protoplast's marvelous creation found in *2 Enoch* 30:9, namely to some of his properties (seeing, hearing, reasoning) given to Adam at his creation.

Enoch concludes his reply to the people with the theme of the restoration of humanity to its prelapsarian «paradisal» condition, further indicating that the whole account revolves around the patriarch's role in the removal of Adam's sin. It is logical, therefore, that this message of hope comes from the patriarch's mouth whose humanity has already been restored to the paradisal condition. In *2 Enoch* 65:8–10 Enoch tells the people that at the end all the righteous who escaped from the Lord's great judgment «will be collected together into the great age ... and they will have a great light, a great indestructible light, and paradise, great and incorruptible. For everything corruptible will pass away, and the incorruptible will come into being, and will be the shelter of the eternal residence».[108]

Conclusion

The limited scope of this paper did not allow the exploration of all the facets of the Adamic polemics in *2 Enoch*.[109] However, some conclusions can be drawn at this stage of the research.

1. The foregoing survey testifies to the existence of Adamic polemics in *2 Enoch*. These polemical developments contain, not only the «internal» debates based on *2 Enoch's* depictions of the protoplast, but also the intertextual polemics with the «external» Adamic traditions attested in the primary Adam books.

2. The analysis shows that Adamic polemics involves a rewriting of «original» Adamic motifs and themes when the details of Adam's «story» are transferred to a new «hero», the seventh antediluvian patriarch Enoch.

3. The analysis demonstrates that, similar to the early booklets of *1 Enoch* the attitude of the author(s) of *2 Enoch* to Adam's figure and the traditions associated with his name, reminds highly polemical. Yet, in comparison with *1 Enoch*, the Slavonic Enoch demonstrates a paradigm shift in polemical strategy. Now the competitive tradition is not silenced but is rather exposed and openly appropriated for polemics. This switch might be connected with the challenge which the intense development of the traditions about the exalted patriarchs and prophets posed to the «classical» profile of Enoch found in early Enochic booklets. Adamic, Mosaic, and Noachic polemics found in *2 Enoch* might represent the reaction of the Enochic tradition to these new

[108] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 192.

[109] One of these unexplored subjects includes the connection between the tradition of Adam's cosmic body in *2 Enoch* 30 and the role of Enoch as the measurer of the divine body in *2 Enoch* 39.

conceptual developments. It should be noted that the traditions about the elevated Adam appear to have been widespread in the Alexandrian environment of the first century CE, the possible place and time of the composition of *2 Enoch*.

4. The investigation of Adamic polemics proves that a number of important passages associated with the early Jewish mysticism, such as the motif of the Divine Face in chapters 22 and 39, the future prominent role of Enoch-Metatron as the governing power on the earth, and his title «Youth», belong to the primary text, since they play a decisive role in the original argument of the Slavonic apocalypse. In the light of this role Böttrich's hypothesis that these themes represent later interpolations must now be dismissed as erroneous.

5. The analysis of the polemical developments in the text also reveals that the theological intentions of its authors were not to find a peaceful consensus with the non-Jewish environment in the Diaspora situation, as Böttrich proposed, but to resolve the internal problems of the Enochic tradition in its encounter with the challenges of its competitors.

ABSTRACT

Adam's story occupies a prominent place in *2 Slavonic (Apocalypse of) Enoch*. The traditions pertaining to the first human can be found in all the sections of the book. In these materials Adam is depicted as a glorious angelic being, predestined by God to be the ruler of the earth, but falling short of God's expectations. The article argues that the extensive presence of Adamic materials in *2 Enoch* has a polemical nature since it is related to the long-lasting competition between Adamic and Enochic traditions. The analysis shows that the polemics taking place in *2 Enoch* involve a rewriting of «original» Adamic motifs and themes when the details of Adam's «story» are transferred to a new «hero», the seventh antediluvian patriarch. The features of Adam's story, his roles and offices, are used in *2 Enoch* as the building blocks for creating the new, celestial identity of the elevated Enoch. In the course of these polemical appropriations, the elevated angelic status of the prelapsarian Adam, his luminosity, his wisdom, and his special roles as the king of the earth and the steward of all earthly creatures are transferred to the new occupant of the celestial realm, the patriarch Enoch, who, near the Lord's throne, is transformed into one of the glorious ones initiated into the highest mysteries by the Lord, becomes the «manager of the arrangements on the earth», and writes down «everything that nourished» on it. The investigation of Adamic polemics in *2 Enoch* demonstrates that a number of important passages associated with early Jewish mysticism, such as the motif of the Divine Face in chapters 22 and 39, the future prominent role of Enoch-Metatron as the governing power on the earth, and his title «Youth», belong to the primary text, since they play a decisive role in Adamic polemics of the Slavonic apocalypse.

Silviu N. Bunta
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

THE *MĒSU*-TREE AND THE ANIMAL INSIDE: THEOMORPHISM AND THERIOMORPHISM IN DANIEL 4

The fourth chapter of the Book of Daniel has received extensive attention from recent scholarship.[1] While modern scholarship has long noted the literary connections of Daniel 4 with Ezekiel 31, it has consistently disregarded the theomorphic character of the enormous tree in Ezekiel 31 and the ideological connections of Daniel 4 with the exilic and post-exilic theomorphic anthropology that underlies Ezekiel 31. It has established no associations between Daniel 4 and the exilic and post-exilic interests in Adam's physical resemblance to YHWH and the concurrent concerns with legitimate expressions of iconic venerations.

An analysis of Daniel 4 within its context and against the background of earlier biblical and ancient Near Eastern sources will evince the focus of the story on the issue of legitimate channels of iconic worship and the theomor-

[1] E.g., M. Henze, Nebuchadnezzar's Madness (Daniel 4) in Syriac Literature // The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception / Ed. J. J. Collins, P. W. Flint. 2 vols. (Leiden—Boston—Koln, 2001) Vol. 2. 550–571; idem, Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar: The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4 (Leiden, 1999) (JSJSup, 61); S. M. Paul, The Mesopotamian Babylonian background of Daniel 1–6 // The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception... Vol. 1. 55–68; T. Meadowcroft, Point of View in Storytelling: An Experiment in Narrative Criticism in Daniel 4 // *Didaskalia* 8 (1997) 30–42; P. Grelot, Nabuchodonosor changé en bête // *VT* 44 (1994) 10–17; H. F. Richter, Daniel 4, 7–14: Beobachtungen und Erwagungen // The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings (Louvain, 1993) 244–248; K. Koch, Gottes Herrschaft über das Reich des Menschen: Daniel 4 im Licht neuer Funde // The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings... 77–119; P. W. Coxon, Another Look at Nebuchadnezzar's Madness // The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings... 211–222; idem, The Great Tree of Daniel // A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William McKane / Ed. J. D. Martin, Ph. R. Davies (Sheffield, 1986) (JSOTSup, 42) 91–111; B. Burkholder, Literary Patterns and God's Sovereignty in Daniel 4 // *Direction* 16 (1987) 45–54; W. H. Shea, Further Literary Structures in Daniel 2–7: An Analysis of Daniel 4 // *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 23 (1985) 193–202; A. A. Di Lella, Daniel 4:7–14: Poetic Analysis and Biblical Background // Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles / Ed. A. Caquot, M. Delcor (Kevelaer, 1981) (AOAT, 212) 247–258; L. F. Hartman, The Great Tree and Nabuchodonosor's Madness // The Bible in Current Catholic Thought / Ed. J. L. McKenzie (New York, 1962) 75–82.

phic connotation of the tree imagery. Cumulative evidence leads to the tentative conclusion that the tree story employs the language and images and develops the ideology of early exilic and postexilic traditions that portray Adam as the equivalent of ancient Near Eastern cultic statues (as the replacement of YHWH's cultic statue of the First Temple no longer extant) and as the only legitimate alternative to idol worship. The imagery of the enormous tree and its iconic connotations originate in the Mesopotamian concept of the *mēsu*-tree, the tree that supplies the flesh of the gods, the material of their statuary presence.

The Text

Chapter 4 of Daniel is preserved in one Aramaic and two Greek versions.[2] The Aramaic text, which seems to be the language of the autograph, is not attested at Qumran, except for verses 29–30 in 4QDan[a]. The earliest manuscript of the Aramaic texts (henceforth MT) is still the Leningrad Codex B 19A, dating from 1008 or 1009 C.E.

There are two extant Greek versions: the Old Greek version (henceforth OG) preserved in two manuscripts[3] and supported by a seventh century literal Syriac translation,[4] and the version attributed to Theodotion (henceforth Th). A text close to the version attributed to Theodotion is attested in the New Testament, which suggests that the textual tradition circulated before the end of the Second Temple period. In chapter 4 Th generally follows MT against OG, as it does in chapters 5 and 6. In the rest of the book Th is closer to OG than to MT.

The MT/Th version of the tree story reads:

---

[2] On the textual history of Daniel 4, see especially T. McLay, It's a Question of Influence: The Theodotion and Old Greek Texts of Daniel // Origen's Hexapla and Fragments (Tübingen, 1998) 231–254; O. Munnich, Les versions grecques de Daniel et leurs substrats semitiques // VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies / Ed. L. Greenspoon, O. Munnich (Atlanta, 1995) 291–308; A. A. Di Lella, The Textual History of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel // The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception… Vol. 2. 586–607; E. Charles Ulrich, The Text of Daniel in the Qumran scrolls // The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception… Vol. 2. 573–585; J. Lust, The Septuagint Version of Daniel 4–5 // Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings… 39–53.

[3] The relevant portions of Papyrus 967 (second or early third century C.E.), discovered in Egypt in 1931 and regrettably divided among three current locations, Dublin, Cologne, and Barcelona, were published in F. G. Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri (London, 1937) Fasc. 7. 17–38; W. Hamm, Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel Kap 3–4 (Bonn, 1977) (PTA, 21). The Barcelona fragment does not contain any texts from chapter 4. The Codex Chisianus or MS 88 (ninth through eleventh centuries C.E.) is the source of the text in A. Rahlfs, Septuaginta (Stuttgart, 1935 and reprints).

[4] A. M. Ceriani, Codex syro-hexaplaris ambrosianus (Milan, 1874).

> 7 There was a tree at the center of the earth (MT בגוא ארעא; Th ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς), and its height was great (MT ורומה שגיא; Th τὸ ὕψος αὐτοῦ πολύ). 8 The tree grew great and strong, its height reached to heaven (MT ורומה ימטא לשמיא; Th τὸ ὕψος αὐτοῦ ἔφθασεν ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ), and its sight to the ends of the whole earth (MT וחזותה לסוף כל־ארעא; Th has instead τὸ κύτος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ πέρατα πάσης τῆς γῆς).[5] 9 Its foliage was beautiful, its fruit abundant, and it provided food for all. The animals of the field found shade under it, the birds of the air nested in its branches, and from it all living beings were fed. 10 I continued looking, in the visions of my head as I lay in bed, and there was a holy watcher, coming down from heaven. 11 He cried aloud and said: «Cut down the tree and chop off its branches, strip off its foliage and scatter its fruit. Let the animals flee from beneath it and the birds from its branches. 12 But leave its stump and roots in the ground, with a band of iron and bronze, in the tender grass of the field. Let him be bathed with the dew of heaven, and let his lot be with the animals of the field in the grass of the earth. 13 Let his mind be changed from that of a human (MT לבבה מן־אנושא; Th ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων), and let the mind of an animal (MT לבב היוה; Th καρδία θηρίου) be given to him».[6]

OG preserves a version very much different from MT/Th[7]:

> 10 Behold an enormous tree seen throughout the world. 11 Its appearance was great, and no other had its likeness. 12 Its branches were about thirty stadia in length, and all the animals of the earth found shade under it, and within it nested all the birds of heaven. Its fruit was abundant and good and fed all living things. And its appearance was great. Its top reached to heaven and its trunk to the clouds, filling the space under heaven; the sun and the moon abode in it and illumined all the earth. I watched in my sleep and behold an angel was sent in power from heaven and spoke and said [to him- MS 88]: «Cut it and destroy it. The Most High commanded to uproot and render it useless». He also said: «Leave one of its roots in the ground, so that it may eat grass like an ox with the animals of the earth on mountains. And from the dew of heaven its body will change and with them it will pasture for seven years, until it knows that the Lord of heaven has dominion over all the things in heaven and over all those on earth, and does with them what he pleases».[8]

---

[5] The Greek translation raises several issues at this point. It is not clear what prompted the use of κύτος.

[6] This and subsequent translations from the Hebrew Bible follow the text of NRSV.

[7] For a thorough review of the differences between the two main versions of Daniel 4, see especially Henze, *Madness*, 24–33.

[8] This is my own translation of the text in Rahlfs, Septuaginta… and J. Ziegler, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 16/2: Susana, Daniel, Bel et Dagon (Göttingen, 1954).

Redaction History

The prevailing consensus in current scholarship is that chapters 2–6 of Daniel constitute an Aramaic unit originally independent from the Hebrew section of the book.[9] This unit itself is most probably a collection and synchronization of originally independent stories. In its extant forms, the Aramaic unit is commonly dated to the Hellenistic period that precedes the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes (i.e., between 330 and 175 B.C.E), with scholarly preferences ranging throughout this period.[10] John Collins notes that «the only datum in the tales that requires so late a date», namely in the Hellenistic period, is the reference to the four kingdoms in Daniel 2.[11] Although the Aramaic unit only names Babylonian (chs. 2–5), Median (6:1), and Persian kingdoms (6:28), the four kingdoms of Daniel 2 most probably also include the Hellenistic kingdom.[12] However, the reference to a fourth kingdom constitutes a very weak basis for dating. Reinhard G. Kratz makes a very good point that the reference to the four kingdoms could be secondary and that the Aramaic unit could well be dated to the Persian period.[13] Martin

[9] On the unity of chapters 2–6, see especially J.-W. Wesselius, Discontinuity, Congruence, and the Making of the Hebrew Bible // *SJOT* 13 (1999) 24–77; idem, The Writing of Daniel // The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception… Vol. 2. 291–310; J. J. Collins, Daniel (Minneapolis, 1993) (Hermeneia) Esp. 24–38; P. S. David, The Composition and Structure of the Book of Daniel: A Synchronic and Diachronic Reading (PhD diss., Katholicke Universiteit, 1991); Lust, The Septuagint Version of Daniel 4–5…; O. Munnich, Texte Massorétique et Septante dans le Livre de Daniel // The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship Between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered / Ed. A. Schenker (Atlanta, 2003) (SCS, 52) 93–120; R. T. McLay, The Old Greek Translation of Daniel Chapters 4–6 and the Formation of the Book of Daniel // *VT* [forthcoming]).

[10] For dating, see Henze, Madness… 10–11; G. Hölscher, Die Entstehung des Buches Daniel // *ThStK* 92 (1919) 113–138; Collins, Daniel… 24–38; R. Albertz, The Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel // The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception… Vol. 1. 171–204; E. Haag, Die Errettung Daniels aus der Löwengrube: Untersuchungen zum Ursprung der biblischen Daniel-tradition (Stuttgart, 1983) (SBS, 10). A. Lenglet (La Structure littéraire de Daniel 2–7 // *Bib* 53 (1972) 169–190) is exceptional in arguing that chapters 4 and 5 address the kingdom of Antiochus Epiphanes. Henze (Madness… 10–11) opts for «a pre-Maccabean context, possibly the third century, with even older material incorporated into them [the Aramaic tales]».

[11] Collins, Daniel… 36.

[12] Ibid. 166–170.

[13] R. G. Kratz, Translatio Imperii: Untersuchungen zu den aramäischen Danieler-zählungen und ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Umfeld (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1991) (WMANT, 63) 134–148.

Noth, while accepting the reference to the Hellenistic kingdoms as central to chapter 2, contends that early nuclei of the Aramaic unit could date from the last decades of the fourth century B.C.E.[14]

Current scholarly consensus allows for the probability that the stories of chapters 2–6 have a long pre-Hellenistic history of independent circulations and that they were only finalized and collected in the first half of the Hellenistic period.[15] In particular the extant textual versions of chapter 4 reflect a sinuous and extensive circulation of the tree story. It has long been proposed that chapter 4 evolved from a sixth century tradition about Nabonidus, and not about Nebuchadnezzar, to which attest several Babylonian documents (the *Nabonidus Chronicle*, *Verse Account of Nabonidus*, and the stelae from Harran).[16]

The *Mēsu*-Tree

The scholarship of Daniel 4 has previously noted the connection of the text to the generic religious symbol of the cosmic tree.[17] However, the symbol is an all-embracing umbrella term for concepts of enormous diversity from different cultural and historical environments, concepts far too complex and diverse to submit to such generalization without inevitable dilution. The association of the tree of Daniel 4 with this generic concept fails to contextualize the biblical narrative. The context for the tree imagery of Daniel 4 might be sought in earlier biblical and ancient Near Eastern sources.

The most commonly evinced literary parallel to Daniel 4 is Ezekiel 31.[18] Ezek 31:2–14 contains a strikingly similar depiction of a tree, which is associated to the Egyptian pharaoh: [19]

> 2. Mortal, say to Pharaoh king of Egypt and to his hordes: Whom are you like in your greatness? 3. Consider Assyria, a cedar of Lebanon, with fair branches and forest shade, and of great height, its top among the clouds.

[14] M. Noth, Zur Komposition des Buches Daniel // *ThStK* 98/99 (1926) 143–163.

[15] Henze, Madness… 11; Collins, Daniel… 38.

[16] Texts in ANET. 305–307, 312–315; S. Smith, Babylonian Historical Texts Relating to the Capture and Downfall of Babylon (London, 1924) 22–123; C. J. Gadd, The Harran Inscriptions of Nabonidus // *AnSt* 8 (1958) 35–92. The materials about Nabonidus are reviewed in Henze, Madness… 57–63. For the connection of Daniel 4 with Nabonidus traditions, see P. Riessler, Das Buch Daniel (Stuttgart—Wien, 1899) 43; Collins, Daniel… 217–219; Henze, Madness… 52–73; Coxon, Another Look… 216–218; Koch, Gottes Herrschaft… 94–98.

[17] Collins, Daniel… 223.

[18] Ibid.; Hartman, Great Tree… 78–79; Coxon, Great Tree… 94–96; Henze, Madness… 77–79.

[19] For a thorough comparison between Daniel 4 and Ezekiel 31, see H. Kvanvig, Roots of Apocalypticism: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man (Neukirchen, 1988) (WMANT, 61) 476–480.

> 4. The waters nourished it, the deep made it grow tall, making its rivers flow around the place it was planted, sending forth its streams to all the trees of the field. 5. So it towered high above all the trees of the field; its boughs grew large and its branches long, from abundant water in its shoots. 6. All the birds of the air made their nests in its boughs; under its branches all the animals of the field gave birth to their young; and in its shade all great nations lived. 7. It was beautiful in its greatness, in the length of its branches; for its roots went down to abundant water. 8. The cedars in the garden of God could not rival it, nor the fir trees equal its boughs; the plane trees were as nothing compared with its branches; no tree in the garden of God was like it in beauty. 9. I made it beautiful with its mass of branches, the envy of all the trees of Eden that were in the garden of God. 10. Therefore thus says the Lord GOD: Because it towered high and set its top among the clouds, and its heart was proud of its height, 11. I gave it into the hand of the prince of the nations; he has dealt with it as its wickedness deserves. I have cast it out. 12. Foreigners from the most terrible of the nations have cut it down and left it. On the mountains and in all the valleys its branches have fallen, and its boughs lie broken in all the watercourses of the land; and all the peoples of the earth went away from its shade and left it. 13. On its fallen trunk settle all the birds of the air, and among its boughs lodge all the wild animals. 14. All this is in order that no trees by the waters may grow to lofty height or set their tops among the clouds, and that no trees that drink water may reach up to them in height. For all of them are handed over to death, to the world below; along with all mortals, with those who go down to the Pit.

Biblical scholarship has also previously noted the connection of the Book of Ezekiel to the Mesopotamian Book of Erra, dated between the eleventh and the eighth century B.C.E., with a general preference in current scholarship for a later date within this period.[20] In tablet I of the poem, the god Erra sets out for Babylon, one of the cities he wants to destroy, to enquire Marduk

[20] For this connection, see D. Bodi, The Book of Ezekiel and the Poem of Erra (Freiburgh—Göttingen, 1991) (OBO, 104); idem, Le Livre d'Ezechiel et le Poeme d'Erra // *ETR* 68 (1993) 1–23; B. Maarsingh, Das Schwertlied in Ez 21,13–22 und das Erra-Gedicht // Ezekiel and His Book. Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation / Ed. J. Lust (Leuven, 1986) 350–358; M. Anbar, Une nouvelle allusion à une tradition babylonienne dans Ézéchiel (XXII 24) // *VT* 29 (1979) 352–353; R. Frankena, Kanttekeningen van een Assyrioloog bij Ezechiël (Leiden, 1965). For the Poem of Erra, see also L. Cagni, The Poem of Erra (Malibu, 1977); idem, L'Epopea di Erra // *StSem* 34 (1969) 192–195; idem, L'Epopea di Erra (Roma, 1969); D. O. Edzard, Irra (Erra) — Epos // Reallexikon der Assyriologie / Ed. E. Ebeling, B. Meissner (Berlin, 1928–) Vol. 5. 168–169; W. G. Lambert, Review of F. Gössmann, *Das Era-Epos* // *AfO* 18 (1957–1958) 389–400; J. Bottéro, Antiquités assyro-babyloniennes (l'Épopée d'Erra) // *Annuaire EPHE* 4 (1977–1978) 107–164. For dating, see Bodi, The Book of Ezekiel and the Poem of Erra… 54–56; Cagni, L'Epopea di Erra… 37–45.

about the tarnished state of the latter's statue and thus to incite the god of Babylon to either abandon his city or to join Erra in destroying it:

> He [Erra] entered Esagila, palace of heaven and earth, and stood in front of him [Marduk].
> He made his voice heard and spoke to the king of gods,
> «Why does the finery, your lordship's adornment which is full of splendour like the stars of heaven, grow dirty?
> Your crown of your lordship which made E-halanki shine like E-temen-anki — its surface is tarnished!» (Erra I 125–128)

Marduk reminds Erra that his previous abandonment of his statue and of the city caused a catastrophic flood. His statue suffered damage and he had to summon the fire god, Gerra, to refurbish it, before he would resume his residence in it:

> As for the finery which had been pushed aside by the Flood, its surface dulled:
> I directed Gerra to make my features radiant, and to cleanse my robes.
> When he had made the finery bright, and finished the work,
> I put on my crown of lordship and went back to my place.
> My features were splendid, and my gaze was awesome!
> (As for) the people who were left from the Flood and saw the result of my action,
> Should I raise my weapons and destroy the remnant?
> I made those (original) Craftsmen go down to the Apsu, and I said they were not to come back up.
> I changed the location of the *mēsu*-tree (and of) the *elmēsu*-stone, and did not reveal it to anyone.

Now, concerning that deed which you have said you will do, Warrior Erra,

> Where is the *mēsu*-wood, the flesh of the gods, the proper insignia of the King of the World,
> The pure timber, tall youth, who is made into a lord,
> Whose roots reach down into the vast ocean through a hundred miles of water, to the base of Arallu,
> Whose topknot above rests on the heaven of Anu? ...
> (Erra I 140–153)[21]

The *mēsu*-tree[22] functions as the «flesh of the gods», concept that, as Angelika Berlejung notes, «im Kontext der Herstellung von Kultbirdern ist...

[21] Translation from S. Dalley, Myths from Mesopotamia (Rev. ed., Oxford, 2000) 290–291.

[22] On the *mēsu*-tree, see W. von Soden, Akkadisches Handwörterbuch I–III (Wiesbaden, 1965–1981) 647a; A. L. Oppenheim et al. (eds.), The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago (Chicago, 1956–) M II 33–34.

haüfig belegt. Er bezeichnet dann jeweils das Material, aus dem die Bilder hergestellt warden».[23]

Another similar depiction of the *mēsu*-tree is extant in STT 199, a tablet dated to the seventh century B.C.E.: [24]

> 13. [Incantation:] as you come out, as you come out in greatness from the forest:
> 14. as you come out from the pure forest, wood of the pure forest...
> 29. as you come from the pure forest of *mēsu* [25]-trees, wood of the pure forest of *mēsu* [26]-trees,
> 30. bright wood, (like) the spring of a stream, which is born in the pure Heavens, spreads out on the clean earth,
> 31. your branches grow up to Heaven, Enki makes your root drink up pure water from the Underworld.[27]

The ensuing text describes the process of the making of the statue out of the enormous tree.

One central feature in the descriptions of the *mēsu*-tree is its enormity, which is meant to accommodate the immense size of the god:

> Die Materialien der Mardukstatue verbinden in sich kosmische Dimensionen (Himmel, Erde, Unterwelt) und bringen bestimmte Eigenschaften mit, die sie mit dem Gott des Kultbildes verbinden und mit ihm gemeinsam haben.[28]

Several main features of the Mesopotamian *mɜsu*-tree emerge in the depiction of the pharaonic tree in Ezekiel 31:

1. The latter is similarly enormous.
2. It feeds on abundant underground waters.
3. Its top reaches the clouds of heaven.
4. It has a conspicuous and prominent location among the other trees of Eden (Erra I 148–153 suggests a similar prominent location of the *mēsu*-tree).

Furthermore, the context of Ezekiel 31 suggests that the pharaonic tree functions as an iconic presence of the divine similarly to the *mēsu*-tree. Eze-

[23] A. Berlejung, Die Theologie der Bilder. Herstellung und Einweihung von Kultbildern in Mesopotamien und die alttestamentliche Bilderpolemik (Göttingen, 1998) 150, n. 821.

[24] Ch. Walker, M. Dick, The Induction of the Cult Image in Ancient Mesopotamia. The Mesopotamian Mīs Pî Ritual (Helsinki, 2001) (The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project) 28.

[25] I preferred a transliteration in accordance to CAD M II 34.

[26] I preferred a transliteration in accordance to CAD M II 34.

[27] Translation from Walker, Dick, The Induction of the Cult Image… 119–120.

[28] Berlejung, Die Theologie der Bilder… 152.

kiel 31 is in evident parallelism with Ezekiel 28.[29] The two stories share several elements. Both are diatribes against foreign nations, namely the king of Tyre and the pharaoh, who is compared to the tree that Assyria represents. Both the tree-Assyria and the king of Tyre are placed in Eden, «the garden of God» (גן־אלהים: 31:8–9; 28:12). Both are beautiful (31:3, 8–10; 28:12). Neither one has «comparisons» (31:8: לא־עממהו; 28:3: לא עממוך). Both have prominent positions in the garden of God. Both commit the mistake of hubris.[30] Both «elevate» themselves (31:10: גבהת; 28:2: גבה) in their hearts (לב, לבב: 31:10; 28:2, 6). The divine reprimands in both cases start with the same formula.[31] The punishment of both is carried out by «foreigners, the most ruthless of nations» (זרים עריצי גוים: 31:12; 28:7). They are both slain by the sword (חלל: 31:18; 28:8,9) among the uncircumcised (ערלים: 31:18; 28:8,9) and are taken down to the pit (31:14; 28:8).[32]

Moreover, the king of Tyre claims divine status, claims to be a «god» (אל: 28:2, 9). The swift divine correction reminds the king that he is a human being (אדם/ἄνθρωπος: 28:2, 9). I have argued elsewhere that in Ezekiel 28 the king of Tyre functions as the cultic statue of YHWH and that Ezekiel 28

[29] Ezekiel 28 has received an extensive attention from modern scholarship. To cite only a few studies: D. Launderville, O.S.B., Ezekiel's Cherub: A Promising Symbol or a Dangerous Idol? // *CBQ* 65 (2004) 165–183; J. E. Miller, The Maelaek of Tyre (Ezekiel 28, 11–19) // *ZAW* 105 (1994) 497–501; Wilson, The Death of the King of Tyre…; N. C. Habel, Ezekiel 28 and the Fall of the First Man // *Concordia Theological Monthly* 38 (1967) 516–524; K. Yaron, The Dirge over the King of Tyre // *ASTI* 3 (1964) 28–57; H. G. May, The King in the Garden of Eden: A Study of Ezekiel 28:12–19 // Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg / Ed. B. Anderson, W. Harrelson (New York, 1962) 166–176; A. J. Williams, The Mythological Background of Ezekiel 28:12–19? // *BTB* 6 (1976) 49–61; K. Jeppesen, You are a Cherub, but no God! // *SJOT* 1 (1991) 83–94; O. Loretz, Der Sturz des Fürsten von Tyrus (Ez 28,1–19) // *UF* 8 (1976) 455–458; J. Barr, «Thou art the Cherub»: Ezekiel 28.14 and the Postexilic Understanding of Genesis 2–3 // Priests, Prophets and Scribes. Essays on the Formation and Heritage of Second Temple Judaism in Honour of Joseph Blenkinsopp / Ed. E. Ulrich, J. W. Wright, R. P. Carroll, Ph. R. Davies (Sheffield, 1992) (JSOTSup, 149) 213–223.

[30] D. I. Block, The Book of Ezekiel. 2 vols (Grand Rapids—Cambridge, 1997, 1998) Vol. 2. 119–125.

[31] Ibil. 180, n. 7.

[32] It has been repeatedly argued that vv. 5, 9–18 are later additions to an original poem that comprised vv. 2–4, 6–8. See thus Hölscher, Hesekiel… 152–155; Block, The Book of Ezekiel… Vol. 2. 178–179. The deletion of vv. 5 and 9 is widely accepted (Zimmerli, Ezekiel… Vol. 2. 142–146; Wevers, Ezekiel… 234) but the authenticity of vv. 10–18 is less disputed. Nevertheless, the parallelism of the passage with Ezekiel 28 transpires even through verses that are commonly undisputed, especially vv. 3 and 8.

employs idol imagery and language to construct an iconic anthropology, also evident in the Priestly ideology (Gen 1:26).[33] It has been previously noted in recent scholarship that the destruction of the First Temple and of its statue[34] forced Judah to reassess and revise its conceptions of divine presence/absence.[35] Exilic and post-exilic texts and artifacts attest to the fact that the

[33] See my article «YHWH's Cultic Statue after 597/586 B.C.E.: A Linguistic and Theological Reinterpretation of Ezek 28:12», forthcoming in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*.

[34] Biblical scholarship has increasingly acknowledged the fact that monarchic Israel and Judah were not aniconic. While current scholarship still favors the concept of «empty space aniconism», it allows more and more for the probability that ancient Judah was not devoid of cultic images and that it worshipped a cultic statue of Yhwh in the First Temple. For the concept of «empty space aniconism» and on the issue of a statue of Yhwh in the First Temple, see A. H. J. Gunneweg, Bildlosigkeit Gottes im Alten Testament // *Henoch* 6 (1984) 257–270; B. Gladigow, Präsenz der Bilder-Präsenz der Götter // *Visible Religion* 4–5 (1985–1986) 114–133; B. Becking, Assyrian Evidence for Iconic Polytheism in Ancient Israel? // The Image and the Book: Iconic Cults, Aniconism, and the Rise of Book Religion in Israel and the Ancient Near East / Ed. K. van der Toorn (Leuven, 1997) 157–171; H. Niehr, In Search of YHWH's Cult Statue in the First Temple // The Image and the Book… 73–96; I. Cornelius, The Many Faces of God: Divine Images and Symbols in Ancient Near Eastern Religions // The Image and the Book… 21–43; Ch. Uehlinger, Anthropomorphic Cult Statuary in Iron Age Palestine and the Search for Yahweh's Cult Images // The Image and the Book… 97–155; idem, Israelite Aniconism in Context // *Bib* 77 (1996) 540–549; M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, «Jahwe und seine Aschera»: Anthropomorphes Kultbild in Mesopotamien, Ugarit und Israel. Das biblische Bilderverbot (Münster, 1992) (UBL, 9); N. Na'aman, No Anthropomorphic Graven Image: Notes on the Assumed Anthropomorphic Cult Statues in the Temples of YHWH in the Preexilic Period // *UF* 31 (1999) 391–415; T. S. Lewis, Divine Images: Aniconism in Ancient Israel // *JAOS* 118 (1998) 36–53; B. B. Schmidt, The Aniconic Tradition: On Readings Images and Viewing Texts // The Triumph of Elohim; From Yahwisms to Judaisms / Ed. D. V. Edelman (Grand Rapids, 1996) 75–105; T. N. D. Mettinger, No Graven Image? Israelite Aniconism in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context (Stockholm, 1995) (ConBOT, 42); idem, Aniconism: A West Semitic Context for the Israelite Phenomenon? // Ein Gott allein? JHWH-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus im Kontext der israelitischen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte / Eds. W. Dietrich, M. Klopfenstein (Freiburg—Göttingen, 1994) 159–178; idem, The Veto on Images and the Aniconic God in Israel // Religious Symbols and Their Functions / Ed. H. Biezais (Stockholm, 1979) (SIDA, 10) 15–29; idem, Israelite Aniconism: Developments and Origins // The Image and the Book… 173–204; K. van der Toorn, The Iconic Book Analogies Between the Babylonian Cult of Images and the Veneration of the Torah // The Image and the Book… 229–248; J. C. de Moor, The Rise of Yahwism (Leuven, 1990) 170–172.

[35] For the issue of the presence/absence of Yhwh, central to exilic and postexilic ideologies, see especially J. F. Kutsko, Between Heaven and Earth. Divine Presence

expectations for the iconic presence of YHWH, expectations innate in the ancient Near Eastern ideological context,[36] survived the destruction of the temple.[37] In contrast to the Deuteronomistic circles, which so radically substituted the preexilic iconic ideology with an anti-iconic *šēm*-theology,[38] in priestly circles emerged a theomorphic anthropology, which defined Adam's special connection to the deity by means of *ṣelem* and *dēmût* (Gen 1:26), terms generally used to denote statues of gods (e.g., Num 33:52; 1 Sam 6:5;

---

and Absence in the Book of Ezekiel (Winona Lake, IN, 2000) (BJSUC, 7); J. Blenkinsopp, History and Prophecy in Ancient Israel (Philadelphia, 1983) 197; G. A. Anderson, Sacrifices and Offerings in Ancient Israel: Studies in Their Social and Political Importance (Atlanta, 1987) (HSM, 41) 93. For this concern in Ezekiel 28, see especially Launderville, Ezekiel's Cherub…

[36] M. Weinfeld notes so succinctly that in the ancient Near Eastern world «having gods meant having idols» (Deuteronomy 1–11 (New York, 1991) (AB, 5) 291). The *only* means of divine presence in a temple was the cult representation of the deity. See thus A. Berlejung, Washing the Mouth: The Consecration of Divine Images in Mesopotamia // The Image and the Book… 45–72, here 61; Niehr, YHWH's Cult Statue… 77; van der Toorn, Iconic Book… 235. An imageless temple would have been therefore as meaningless as a house without habitants. The temple was not complete until the god had taken its place in it. After the completion of the building followed a ritual referred to as «causing the deity to dwell in it» (Niehr, YHWH's Cult Statue… 78). The making of the idol and its placement in the temple constituted the completion of the construction of the temple. The two acts are never fully independent. E.g., Sennacherib is called in one text «he who made the image of his god and built his (the god's) favorite temple» (CAD E 200a, OIP 2.146:31). As Avigdor Hurowitz notes, «if the dedication of a house is accomplished by its builder taking up residence in it, so a temple, which is primarily conceived of as a divine dwelling place, is dedicated by its divine resident taking up residence within it» (A. Hurowitz, I Have Built You an Exalted House. Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semitic Writings (Sheffield, 1992) (JSOTSupp, 115) 267).

[37] Cf. Psalm 115:2–8; Isa 40:18–19 (= Isa 46:5–6); 42:8–9; Jer 2:26–27; 10:14–16.

[38] In this ideology, the place of worship becomes only a dwelling for the ultimately unconfined and immaterial name of God (e.g., 1 Kgs 8:16–20,29,44,48; 2 Sam 7:13). Weinfeld, one of the main analysts of the *šēm* ideology, summarizes: «The deuterenomic school used this phraseology in a very consistent manner and never made the slightest digression from it. There is not one example in the deuteronomic literature of *God' dwelling* in the temple or the building of a house *for God*. The temple is always the *dwelling of his name*, and the house was built *for his name*» (Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School… 193). For the Deuteronomic circles YHWH dwells physically in a secluded heaven (1 Kgs 8:27–49; Deut 26:15; 33:26). YHWH's presence on earth is exclusively mediated through his name. The Sinai event is revised and purged of any reference to the form or bodily appearance of YHWH (Deut 4:12). YHWH spoke from heaven and not from the top of the mountain and the contact with him was not visual, but auditory (cf. Deut 4:12,32,36; 5:4,22–23).

2 Kgs 11:18; Ezek 7:20; 16:17; 23:24; Amos 5:26; see also Isa 40:18–19a and 46:5–6). Previous scholarship has thus remarked that the Priestly ideology regarded Adam as the equivalent of a pagan cult statue or idol, a legitimate channel for the worship of YHWH.[39]

The Book of Ezekiel as a whole similarly constitutes an assessment of the cataclysm of the destruction of the temple and a reformulation of the divine presence amidst the exiled Judah.[40] It has been previously noted in modern scholarship that the exilic concept of humanity as representation of the divine, as the *ṣelem* and *dēmût* of YHWH (Gen 1:26), was formulated under a most probable influence from ancient Near Eastern ideologies regarding the function of royalty as images of the divine.[41] In Ezekiel 28 and 31, the common ancient Near Eastern conception of the monarch as a divine statue is deconstructed and its vestigial imageries and concepts are employed to redefine humanity as theomorphic, but not isotheic. In an evident polemical engagement, the Book of Ezekiel chooses an ancient Near Eastern king to exemplify its theomorphic anthropology of evident priestly origins.

This anthropologic agenda of the Book of Ezekiel transpires throughout both chapter 28 and the tree story of Ezekiel 31. Block has noted that the «critical question» of Ezekiel 31 is «whom are you like (אל־מי דמית) in your greatness?» (v. 2, 18).[42] The question closely parallels a common exilic challenge to compare YHWH with an idol: «To whom can you liken (אל־מי תדמיון) God» (Isa 40:18, 25; 46:5). Ezekiel's comparison of the pharaoh to

[39] See especially E. Zenger, Gottes Bogen in den Wolken (Stuttgart, 1983) 84–96; A. Angerstorfer, Hebräisch *dmwt* und aramäisch *dmw(t)* // *BN* 24 (1984) 30–43; Smith, Divine Form and Size… 426–427; C. L. Patton, Adam as the Image of God: An Exploration of the Fall of Satan in the *Life of Adam and Eve* // SBL Seminar Papers, 1994 (Atlanta, 1994) (SBLSP, 33) 294–300; Th. Podella, Das Lichtkleid JHWHs (Tübingen, 1996) 252–259; Niehr, YHWH's Cult Statue… 93–94; Kutsko, Between Heaven and Earth… 65–76. See also G. von Rad, Genesis. A Commentary (Rev. ed., Philadelphia, 1972) 57–58; idem, Old Testament Theology 2 vols (New York, 1962, 1965) Vol. 2. 67–69; J. C. de Moor, The Duality in God and Man: Gen 1:26–27 as P's Interpretation of the Yahwistic Creation Account // Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel (Leiden, 1998) (OTS, 40) 112–125, especially 115.

[40] For this focus in the Book of Ezekiel, see especially Kutsko, Between Heaven and Earth…

[41] For these influences, see H. Wildberger, Das Abbild Gottes Gen 1:26–30 // *TZ* 21 (1965) 245–259, 481–501; E. M. Curtis, Man as the Image of God in Genesis in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Parallels (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1984) Esp. 80–102, 113–119, 155–172; Ph. Bird, «Male and Female He Created Them»: Gen 1:27b in the Context of the Priestly Account of Creation // *HTR* 74 (1981) 129–159; J. M. Miller, In the «Image» and «Likeness» of God // *JBL* 91 (1972) 289–304; Kutsko, Between Heaven and Earth… 60–63.

[42] Block, The Book of Ezekiel… Vol. 2. 179.

the Assyria-tree[43] recalls the concept of the *mēsu*-tree, which serves as material for the statues of gods, as their «flesh».[44] Just like the Book of Ezekiel, the Poem of Erra, which most probably introduces the tree imagery to the Book of Ezekiel, also deals with devastations that threaten divine presences and offers paradigms of reconciliation between these cataclysmic realities and the habitation of the gods in their statues.[45]

The main common features of the tree of Ezekiel 31 and of the Mesopotamian *mēsu*-tree appear in the depiction of the tree in Daniel 4:

1. The latter is enormous.
2. Its top reaches the clouds of heaven.
3. It has the most conspicuous location in the middle of the earth.

Moreover, the sin of the tree of Daniel 4 is hubris, as is the sin of the kings in Ezekiel 28 and 31.

The probability that the tree of Daniel 4 is a development of the ancient concept of the *mēsu*-tree is further supported by the fact that its destruction reflects mutilations and desecrations of cultic images. Throughout the ancient Near East, including Canaan, statues of gods were built of wood, as the very concept of the *mēsu*-tree suggests (cf. Isa 37:19 = 2 Kgs 19:18).[46] Destructions and mutilations of divine statues are therefore commonly depicted in terms of «cutting down», «chopping off», «stripping off», «burning», and «scattering». Although extant accounts of destructions of captured divine images from the ancient Near East are scarce,[47] the process, more or less homogenous, most often entailed casting the statue to the ground (cf. 1 Sam 5:3), cutting it off (גדע: Deut 7:5; 12:3; cf. Isa 10:33; כרת: 1 Sam 5:4; 1 Kgs 15:13; Exod 34:13; Mic 1:7), smashing it (שבר: Ezek 6:6; Isa 21:9), burning

[43] The reference to Assyria is often disputed in scholarship (L. C. Allen, Ezekiel 2 vols (Dallas, 1990, 1994) Vol. 2. 122–123; Block, The Book of Ezekiel… Vol. 2. 184). It is often proposed to emend אשור to תאשור, «cypress».

[44] Moreover, the trees of Assyria are called in a Babylonian text «the luxurious forest of Marduk» (ANET. 307). The *mēsu*-tree is commonly described as a «luxuriant wood». Erra/Nergal's temple in Cuthah was called E-meslam or Meslam («luxuriant *mēsu*-tree»). It seems that they provided the wood for divine statues.

[45] For this focus in the Poem of Erra, see Bodi, The Book of Ezekiel and the Poem of Erra… 61–68. For the common program and focus of the Book of Ezekiel and the Poem of Erra on issues of divine presence/absence, see Bodi, The Book of Ezekiel and the Poem of Erra… 182–218.

[46] For wood as the material for ancient Near Eastern divine statues, see also Berlejung, Die Theologie der Bilder… 120–124. For wood as material of divine statues in the Hebrew Bible, see also ibid., 365–367.

[47] See especially Th. Baran, Leben und Tod der Bilder // Ad bene et fideliter seminandum. Festschrift K. Deller / Ed. G. Mauer, U. Magen (Kevelaer—Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1988) (AOAT, 220) 55–60; M. A. Brandes, Destruction et mutilation de statues en Mésopotamie // *Akkadica* 16 (1980) 28–41.

it (שרף: 1 Kgs 15:13; 2 Kgs 23:6; Deut 7:5, 25; 1 Chr 14:12; cf. also Mic 1:7; Isa 37:19 = 2 Kgs 19:18), and scattering its ashes (שלך: 2 Kgs 23:6; Exod 32:20; Deut 7:5; 12:3).[48] The mutilation and destruction of the resemblance and of the divine paraphernalia of statues was perceived as the end of their numinous character, of the presence of the gods within them.

The tree of Daniel 4 is mutilated in similar terms. The verb קצץ is particularly significant. It does not only refer to mutilations of human bodies (e.g., Judg 1:6; 2 Sam 4:12; 2 Kgs 18:16), but also to the mutilation of cultic objects, particularly to the chopping off of their golden layers (cf. 2 Kgs 16:17; 18:16).[49] In 2 Kgs 24:13 the term defines the destruction and desecration of the vessels of the First Temple in 597 B.C.E. Niehr suggests that the chopping (קצץ) of the cultic objects in the temple may reflect the destruction of the central cultic image of YHWH in the holy of holies.[50] In 2 Chr 28:24, which is built on 2 Kgs 24:14, קצץ refers to a similar destructive act.

That the tree imagery of Daniel 4 has theomorphic/iconic connotations is also suggested in the opening of the story (4:1), which describes Nebuchadnezzar «flourishing» (רענן) «in his palace» (MT בהיכלי) or «on his throne» (OG ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου μου). Coxon notes that the term רענן «is purposefully deployed in the king's opening speech to signal a subtle connection with the subject of his dream» and that «in the literary structure of the chapter it does achieve an effective *double-entendre*».[51] Both Coxon and Matthias Henze remark that the word commonly refers to the freshness and luxuriousness of trees (Hos 14:9; Ps 52:10) and seems to allude in the context of Daniel 4 to the deuteronomistic reference to idolatry as worship «under any green/luxurious tree» (תחת כל־עץ רענן: Deut 12:2; 1 Kgs 14:23; 2 Kgs 17:10; etc.).[52] The term also recalls another main feature of the *mēsu*-tree, the wood meant to supply the statuary flesh of the gods, namely luxuriousness. The *mēsu*-tree is commonly portrayed as the most luxurious of all trees.

[48] See also *Rassam Cylinder* v.119–120; vi.62–64. Translation in ARAB. Vol. 2. 308, 310. For the probable allusion to this practice in 1 Sam 5:3–4, see W. Zwickel, Dagons abgeschlagener Koft (1 Sam V 3–4) // *VT* 44 (1994) 239–249.

[49] Niehr, YHWH's Cult Statue… 91; Mettinger, Dethronement… 61; W. Thiel, קצץ // TWAT. Vol. 7. 105–106.

[50] «YHWH's Cult Statue», 91. Mettinger also notes that the biblical account seems to suggest «the throne was stripped of its gold plate already in 597» (Dethronement… 61). Ps 74:6–7, which mentions the breaking of the «carved work» (פתוח) and the burning of the sanctuary, might also allude to this disastrous event.

[51] Coxon, Great Tree… 97.

[52] Ibid.; Henze, Madness… 75.

Context

The tradition that underlies chapter 4 of Daniel, at first most probably in reference to Nabonidus, and not Nebuchadnezzar, as noted above, seems to have developed in connection with concerns about legitimate iconic worship. The Qumranic *Prayer of Nabonidus*, 4Q242 1, which preserves a form of this underlying tradition,[53] identifies Nabonidus' punishment with idol worship:

1. The words of the p[ra]yer which Nabonidus, king of [Baby]lon, [the great]king, prayed [when he was smitten]
2. with a bad disease by the decree of G[o]d in Teima. [I, Nabonidus, with a bad disease]
3. was smitten for seven years and sin[ce] God set [his face on me, he healed me]

([שרי א]ל הא על י אנפוהי ואסא ל י)

4. and as for my sin, he remitted it. A diviner (he was a Jew fr[om among the exiles) came to me and said:]
5. «Pro[cla]im and write to give honour and exal[tatio]n to the name of G[od Most High», and I wrote as follows:]
6. «I was smitten by a b[ad] disease in Teima [by the decree of the Most High God.]
7. For seven years [I] was praying [to] the gods of silver and gold, [bronze, iron,]
8. wood, stone, clay, since [I thoug]ht that th[ey were] gods...[54]

The manuscript has been paleographically dated to 75–50 B.C.E.[55] Most scholars, however, would argue that 4Q242 reflects closer proximity than Daniel 4 to the early pre-Hellenistic traditions about Nabonidus on which the latter developed.[56]

---

[53] The prayer was first published in J. T. Milik, La «prière de Nabonide» at autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel // *RB* 63 (1956) 407–415. Subsequent editions comprise J. J. Collins, 4QPrayer of Nabonidus // Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts. Part 3 / Ed. G. J. Brooke et al. (Oxford, 1996) (DJD, XXII) 83–93; É. Puech, «La prière de Nabonide (4Q242) // Targumic and Cognate Studies: Essays in Honour of Martin McNamara / Ed. K. J. Cathcart, M. Maher (Sheffield, 1996) 208–227; F. M. Cross, Fragments of the Prayer of Nabonidus // *IEJ* 34 (1984) 260–264; F. García Martínez, The Prayer of Nabonidus: A New Synthesis // idem, Qumran and Apocalyptic (Leiden, 1992) 116–136; P. Grelot, La prière de Nabonide (4Q Or Nab). Nouvel Essai de restauration // *RevQ* 9 (1978) 483–495; R. Meyer, Das Gebet des Nabonid. Eine in den Qumran-Handschriften wiederentdeckte Weisheitserzählung (Berlin, 1962).

[54] The text and translation are from Collins, 4QPrayer of Nabonidus… 88–89.

[55] Puech, La prière de Nabonide… 209; Cross, Fragments of the Prayer of Nabonidus… 260; Collins, 4QPrayer of Nabonidus… 85.

[56] See thus P. W. Flint, The Daniel Tradition at Qumran // Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls / Ed. C. A. Evans, P. W. Flint (Grand Rapids, 1997)

There are several parallelisms between Daniel 4 and 4Q242:

1. Both texts refer to a Babylonian king.
2. In both texts the king is afflicted with a serious punishment.
3. In both texts the affliction lasts for seven years.
4. In both texts the affliction is announced by a decree.
5. As Collins notes, «in both a Jew interprets his [the king's] situation».[57]
6. In both texts the king speaks in the first person.[58]

It has been also proposed that 4Q242 contained a dream that the diviner interprets, dream that contained a vision of a tree.[59] While this proposal is highly speculative and ultimately unsolvable, lines 7–8 place Nabonidus' affliction within a context of iconic concerns. Nabonidus' disease is not inadvertently associated with idol worship.

It is also significant that, according to Collins' reconstruction, Nabonidus' healing, the curing of idolatry, is described as imprinting with the divine face (cf. [שרי א]להא עלי אנפוהי ואסא לי). Milik and García Martínez, however, read שרי as a passive participle and reconstruct as «et loin [des hommes j]e fus relégué» and, respectively, «banished far from men».[60] Collins rightly points out that such reading would wrongly assume that שרי is a passive participle. Indeed, a passive participle would be spelled with final *aleph* or *he*, and not *yod*. «An anomalous spelling with a *yod* cannot be completely ruled out», he continues, «but we should assume normal spelling unless we have compelling evidence to the contrary».[61] Collins consequently follows Grelot and reads שרי as a Pael active, 'set'. While in targumic texts the phrase «to set the face on someone» is an idiom for paying attention,[62] in reference to Nabonidus' «healing» from idolatry the phrase would carry evident iconic overtones. Nevertheless, this reconstruction is as speculative and hypothetical as any other. The imagery of 4Q242, whether Collins' recon-

41–60; F. M. Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies (Garden City, 1961) 123–124. It is, however, improbable that there is a direct literary relationship between Daniel 4 and 4Q242: Henze, Madness… 66–68; Cross, The Ancient Library… 123–124.

[57] Collins, Daniel… 217.

[58] For parallelisms and differences between Daniel 4 and 4Q242, see also Collins, Daniel… 217–219; Henze, Madness… 64–68; Koch, Gottes Herrschaft… 89–94; M. McNamara, Nabonidus and the Book of Daniel // *ITQ* 37 (1970) 131–149; García Martínez, The Prayer of Nabonidus… 129–130.

[59] See review of this position in Collins, Daniel… 218, and idem, 4QPrayer of Nabonidus… 87.

[60] García Martínez, The Prayer of Nabonidus… 120; Milik, La «prière de Nabonide»… 408.

[61] Collins, 4QPrayer of Nabonidus… 90.

[62] Ibid.

struction is accurate or not, focuses on concerns regarding legitimate channels of iconic worship.[63]

A similar focus on legitimate channels of iconic worship emerges throughout the context of Daniel 4. All three stories that encircle Daniel 4, namely Daniel 2, 3, and 5, converge on iconic concerns. In Daniel 2 Nebuchadnezzar dreams of a large (רב) and great (שגיא) statue (צלם) (2:31). Daniel proves to know the king's dream and interprets it. The story ends with Nebuchadnezzar worshipping Daniel: he «fell prostrate and worshipped (נפל על־אנפוהי ולדני אל סגד) Daniel and ordered that sacrifice and incense be offered to him» (2:46). Nebuchadnezzar's behavior is, to say the least, striking. The more striking this act is as it is followed in chapter 3 with a story about Nebuchadnezzar imposing on his subjects the cult of a newly built idol of enormous proportions (3:1).

Daniel 4 share with chapters 2 and 3 a focus on external appearances; the subjects in all of these narratives share a common feature, namely enormity. Both stories preceding Daniel 4 mention iconic venerations in evident interconnection: in 2:46 Nebuchadnezzar worships Daniel himself, while throughout chapter 3 Nebuchadnezzar tries to impose the worship of an idol. Crispin Fletcher-Louis has noted that the close similarity between the worship of Adam by angels in *Life of Adam and Eve* 12–16 and Daniel 3 suggests that «the former owes its genius to the early Hellenistic period when Daniel 3 was written» and that both texts attest to an early tradition about the iconicity of humanity.[64]

Daniel 5 contains a similar concern with idol worship. In what the chapter presents as one act (cf. 5:4), Nebuchadnezzar's son, Belshazzar, and his court defile the vessels of the First Temple and worship idols (5:1–4). It is significant that Belshazzar's idolatrous act is directly associated with Nebuchadnezzar's story in chapter 4.

Theomorphism versus Theriomorphism or Angelomorphism as the Decadence of Humanity

The focus of the whole context of Daniel 4 on issues of legitimate iconic worship leads to further possible iconic connotations of the imageries of Daniel 4. Several scholars have contented that the animal deformation of the tree constitutes a tradition that was associated with the tree dream at later stages in the development of Daniel 4.[65] It is impossible to determine the stage at

[63] It is equally speculative to read with Puech in the missing space a reference to a transformation into an animal (La «prière de Nabonide»… 211).

[64] C. Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory of Adam. Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls (Leiden—Boston—Köln, 2002) (STDJ, 42) 101–103.

[65] Collins, Daniel… 219; Coxon, Great Tree… 99–100;

which the story of Daniel 4 incorporated the tradition. Collins rightfully notes that reading the tradition within the lacunae of 4Q242 is unfounded.[66] It is evident, however, that the incorporation, present in both versions of Daniel 4, occurred in the third century B.C.E. or earlier.

Nebuchadnezzar's theriomorphism has been generally read through the lens of ancient Near Eastern depictions of human heroes with animal traits or life-habits.[67] In parallelism to these depictions, Nebuchadnezzar's theriomorphism would symbolize a reversal of the development of humankind from its original animalic state. However, the concept that humanity was in its original state animalic does not appear anywhere in the Hebrew Bible, albeit suggested in the preexilic creation story. Second, the Priestly ideology behind the first creation story is very emphatic about the fact that humanity bears a physical resemblance to YHWH. Daniel 4 is indebted to this ideology in its concern with legitimate iconic worships.

The concern of the whole section Daniel 2–5 with legitimate channels of iconic worship evinces another connotation of Nebuchadnezzar's theriomorphism. In the terms of the parable, by becoming theriomorphic, Nebuchadnezzar loses his dendromorphism-theomorphism and appropriates the subordinate status of the ones who subsist on the tree. In verse 9 the tree is mentioned to have provided «food for all. The animals of the field found shade under it, the birds of the air nested in its branches, and from it all living beings were fed». In his theriomorphism, Nebuchadnezzar ceases to function as a divine image and becomes one of those who merely subsist on the theomorphism of the image.

In the terms of the parable the creatures who subsist on the iconicity of humanity are not humans. Concurrent and subsequent traditions about the iconic function of Adam suggest that these creatures stand for angels. Several studies have explored the development of the tradition according to which angels are created to worship Adam, who functions as the statue of God.[68] The tradition achieves full development in post-Second Temple sources, but it is already witnessed in 4Q381 1,10–11:

10 וכל צבאיו ומל[כיו...] 11 [...ו]לעבד לאדם ולשרתו

[66] Collins, 4QPrayer of Nabonidus… 90.

[67] Coxon, Another Look…; Henze, Madness… 90–99; G. Mobley, The Wild Man in the Bible and the Ancient Near East // *JBL* 116 (1997) 217–233, here 227–228.

[68] On this tradition, see G. Anderson, The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan // Literature on Adam and Eve / Ed. G. Anderson et al. (Leiden—Boston—Köln, 2000) (SVTP) 83–110; P. Schäfer, Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen. Untersuchungen zur Rabbinichen Engelvorstellung (Berlin, 1975); J. P. Schultz, Angelic Opposition to the Ascension of Moses and the Revelation of the Law // *JQR* 61 (1970/1971) 282–307; A. Marmorstein, Controversies Between the Angels and the Creator // *Melilah* 3–4 (1950) 93–102 (in Hebrew).

[10] all his hosts and [his] ange[ls…] [11] […] to serve man (or Adam) and to minister to him […][69]

The calligraphy belongs to the first half of the first century B.C.E.,[70] but multiple stylistic, ideological, and linguistic considerations determined the editor of the text, Eileen M. Schuller, to conclude that the Qumranic manuscript is itself a copy of an autograph from the Persian or early Hellenistic periods.[71]

Fletcher-Louis notes that the text bears witness «to a widespread belief that when Adam was originally created the angels were made to serve and even worship Adam».[72] He further notes that «both the verbs and nouns which are used in 4Q381 have a strongly cultic orientation for the community that used the text».[73] The expression עבד לאדם closely parallels the common biblical phrase עבד אלהים, which refers to idol worship.[74] Moreover, in the Hebrew Bible שרת is almost exclusively used in reference to the worship of YHWH in the Temple. In Ezek 20:32 the verb refers to idol worship: שרת עץ ואבן. By employing the two verbs, עבד and שרת, which suggest idolatry, the text suggests that the reverence due to Adam is liturgical/iconic in nature.

The tradition underlies the reference of Daniel 3 to the serving and worshipping (פלח and סגד) of Nebuchadnezzar's idol (vv. 12, 14, 18). In v. 28 Nebuchadnezzar decrees that the only god to be served and worshipped (פלח and סגד) throughout his empire is to be the god of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. In the narrative preceding this decree, namely in Dan 2:46, Nebuchadnezzar falls prostrate and worships (סגד) Daniel. The purely liturgical connotation of the king's actions is further evinced by his order that sacrifices and incense be offered to Daniel (2:46). Both פלח and סגד appear in Targum Neofiti in reference to idol worship (e.g., Gen 34:31; Exod 20:5; 23:24; Num 25:5; Deut 3:29; 4:19; 5:9; 6:4; 11:6; 12:30; 26:10).

---

[69] The Hebrew text can be found in E. M. Schuller, Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection (Atlanta, 1986) (HSS, 28) 71; The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition / Ed. F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar. 2 vols (Leiden—New York—Köln, 1997) Vol. 2. 754–755. The English translation is from Schuller, Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran… 76. Schuller's text and translation are reprinted in E. M. Schuller, 4QNon-Canonical Psalms // Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts. Part 1 / Ed. E. Eshel et al. (Oxford, 1997) (DJD, XI) 75–172.

[70] Schuller, 4QNon-Canonical Psalms… 88.

[71] Schuller, Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran… 21–52.

[72] Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory of Adam… 98.

[73] Ibid. 99–100.

[74] Exod 23:24, 33; Deut 4:28; 7:4, 16; 8:19; 11:16; 12:30; 13:2, 6, 13; 28:14, 36, 64; 29:18; 30:17; 31:20; Josh 23:7, 16; 24:16, 20; 1 Sam 16:19; 1 Kgs 9:6; 2 Kgs 17:35; Jer 5:19; 11:10; 13:10; 16:13; 25:6; 35:15; 44:3; 2 Chr 7:19.

Within the parameters of this ideological context and of the tree parable, by losing his theomorphism and becoming theriomorphic, Nebuchadnezzar ceases to be object of worship and becomes worshipper. Moreover, in his angelization he also destroys the only legitimate object of iconic worship: himself. The connection with Daniel 3 and Daniel 5 suggests that the Babylonian king is only left to worship idols. The iconic-anthropologic function of the parable converges with the tradition in 4Q242, in which Nabonidus' sin-disease is depicted as idolatry.

Conclusions

Several conclusions can be safely drawn at the present stage of the research. First, Daniel 4 shares with Ezekiel 31 the imagery of an enormous tree. Several common features of the trees emerge: they are both enormous, both reach the heavens with their tops, and both have conspicuous and prominent locations. The imagery is most probably an appropriation of the Mesopotamian concept of the *mēsu*-tree, tree that exhibits the same characteristics: it is enormous, it feeds on abundant underground waters, its top reaches the clouds of heaven, and it has a conspicuous and prominent location among the other trees.

Second, the *mēsu*-tree is the iconic tree *par excellence*; it provides the flesh of the gods, the material of their statues. The contexts of both Daniel 4 and Ezekiel 31 suggest that in both texts the enormous trees fulfill a similar iconic function, namely constitute iconic presences of the divine.

Third, the image of the iconic tree occurs in both Daniel 4 and Ezekiel 31 in contexts of concerns with legitimate channels of iconic worship. Like Ezekiel 28–32, Daniel 2–5 constructs a complex anthropology that identifies humanity as the only legitimate alternative to idols. Cumulative evidence leads to the tentative conclusion that already in the exilic period (Ezekiel 28 and 31) an anthropology that defined primeval humanity as the cultic statue of YHWH emerged in circles of the priestly class. The story of Daniel 4 attests to the fact that the Persian period witnessed a development of these speculations about the iconic value of humanity.

ABSTRACT

The present article offers an analysis of Daniel 4. It argues that the literary origins of the tree imagery in the biblical text most probably lie in Mesopotamian conceptions of the *mēsu*-tree, the tree that supplies the flesh of the gods, the material of their statuary presence. The presence of the imagery in Ezekiel 31 suggests that the Mesopotamian concept was incorporated into exilic and post-exilic redefinitions of the legitimate channels of the iconic worship of YHWH. Within a priestly redefinition of YHWH's iconic presence in Judah, Adam's physical re-

semblance to YHWH provided in humanity the only legitimate alternative to idol worship. Daniel 4 and its context exhibit similar ideological concerns and construct a similar solution to the ongoing iconic dilemma: humanity functions as the only legitimate equivalent of ancient Near Eastern cultic statues, as the replacement of YHWH's cultic statue of the First Temple no longer extant. The iconic connotation of the tree imagery requires a reassessment of the animal deformation of the tree, albeit a late addition to the original stratum of the narrative. Commonly interpreted through the lens of ancient Near Eastern depictions of human heroes with animal traits or life-habits, Nebuchadnezzar's loss of his dendromorphism can only mean in the terms of the parable the deformation of a theomorphic state. Within the parameters of this ideological context and of the tree parable, by losing his theomorphism and becoming theriomorphic, Nebuchadnezzar ceases to be object of worship and becomes worshipper. Moreover, in his deformation he also destroys the only legitimate object of iconic worship: himself. The context of Daniel 4, namely Daniel 3 and Daniel 5, suggests that in its deformed state humanity is only left to mistakenly worship idols.

Andrei A. Orlov
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

RESURRECTION OF ADAM'S BODY: THE REDEEMING ROLE OF ENOCH-METATRON IN *2 (SLAVONIC) ENOCH*[1]

In *2 Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse written in the first century CE, a hint about the angelic status of its hero is expressed through his refusal to participate in a family meal. Chapter 56 of this work depicts Methuselah inviting his father Enoch to share food with the close family. In response to this offer the patriarch, who has recently returned from a long celestial journey, politely declines the invitation of his son offering him the following reasons:

> Listen, child! Since the time when the Lord anointed me with the ointment of his glory, food has not come into me, and earthly pleasure my soul does not remember, nor do I desire anything earthly.[2]

The important feature of this passage from the Slavonic apocalypse is the theme of the «ointment of glory», a luminous substance which transformed the former family man into a celestial creature who is no longer able to enjoy earthly food. This motif of transforming ointment is not confined solely to chapter 56 of *2 Enoch* but plays a prominent part in the overall theology of the text. The importance of this motif can be illustrated by its significance in the central event of the story, the hero's radiant metamorphosis in the front of God's *Kavod*. *2 Enoch* 22:9 portrays the archangel Michael anointing Enoch with delightful oil, the ointment of glory identical to that mentioned in chapter 56. The text tells us that the oil's appearance in this procedure was «greater than the greatest light and its ointment is like sweet dew, and it is like rays of the glittering sun». [3]

One can see that in the Slavonic text the oil of mercy, also known in Adamic traditions as the oil of resurrection, is responsible for the change of Enoch's mortal nature into the glorious state of a celestial being. It is also significant that the oil appears here to be synonymous with the Glory of the Deity since the longer recension of *2 Enoch* 56 describes the oil as the «ointment of the Lord's glory». In this respect it should not be forgotten that Enoch's

---

[1] This paper was presented in 2003 to the Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism Group at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature.

[2] *2 Enoch* 56:2, the longer recension. F. A. Andersen, 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 182.

[3] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 138.

embrocation with shining oil takes place in front the Lord's glorious extent, labeled in *2 Enoch* as the Divine Face. The patriarch's anointing therefore can be seen as covering with Glory coming from the Divine *Kavod*.

At this point it must be noted that several manuscripts of the shorter recension bring some problematic discrepancies to this seamless array of theological motifs pertaining to the patriarch's anointing. They insist that the patriarch was anointed not with ointment of the Lord's glory but instead with the ointment coming from Enoch's head. Thus two manuscripts of the shorter recension (*A* and *U*) insist that the patriarch was anointed not with ointment of *the Lord's glory* but instead with the ointment coming from Enoch's head.

The passage from chapter 56 attested in the manuscripts *A* and *U* reads: «Since the time when the Lord anointed me with the ointment of my [Enoch's] head (елѣемь главы моеа)...».[4]

This tradition which describes the miraculous power of the oil coming from the head of the main character of the text appears to be quite puzzling. Yet in the light of the later Jewish materials this motif about the transforming substance coming from the head of the celestial creature might not be entirely incomprehensible. For example, in *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* 34 one learns that the reviving dew, a rabbinic metaphor for the oil of the resurrection, will come at the eschatological time from the head of the Deity:

> Rabbi Tanchum said: On account of the seed of the earth, when it is commanded, (it) discharges the dew for the resurrection of the dead. From what place does it descend? From the head of the Holy One; for the head of the Holy One, is full of the reviving dew. In the future life the Holy One, will shake His head and cause the quickening dew to descend, as it is said, «I was asleep, but my heart waked ... for my head is filled with dew, my locks with the drops of the night» (Song of Songs 5.2).[5]

In another prominent compendium of Jewish mystical traditions this motif about the dew of resurrection coming from the head of God is repeated again. The *Zohar* 1:130b–131a reads:

> And at the time when the Holy One will raise the dead to life He will cause dew to descend upon them from His head. By means of that dew all will rise from the dust.... For the tree of life emanates life unceasingly into the universe. [6]

---

[4] М. И. Соколов, Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий, VII: Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного / Тексты, латинский пер. и исследование. Посмертный труд автора приготовил к изд. М. Сперанский // *ЧОИДР* 4 (1910) 123.

[5] Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer / Tr. G. Friedländer (New York, 1965) 260.

[6] The Zohar / Tr. H. Sperling, M. Simon. 5 vols (London—New York, 1933) Vol. 2. 21.

Both passages about the reviving dew, as well as the tradition found in *2 Enoch* 22, might have their earlier background in Psalm 133:2–3 where the precious oil running down on the head (כשמן הטוב על הראש ירד) of Aaron is compared with the dew of the eternal life sent by the Deity. Yet *2 Enoch's* accounts about the oil of anointing appear to emphasize not only the priestly but also the eschatological role of the translated patriarch who is predestined to play an important part in redemption of humanity from the sin of the Protoplast.

The question remains, however, how the traditions about the dew of resurrection coming from the Deity's head are related to the problematic readings postulating that the resurrection oil is coming not from the head of the Lord but instead from the head of Enoch. The confusion between the head of the seer and the Deity's head, God's oil and the oil of Enoch, the glory of the Lord and the glory of the exalted patriarch reflected in Slavonic text, does not appear to be coincidental. It seems to reflect a significant theological tendency of the text where Enoch's heavenly «persona» is understood as the «replica» of the Divine *Kavod*, in front of which the visionary was recreated as a heavenly being. The similarities between the two celestial corporealities — The Divine *Kavod* and the newly acquired celestial extent of Enoch-Metatron, which in some traditions serves as the measurement of the divine body — have been previously explored in several important studies. This paper however seeks to address another eschatological dimension in which Enoch's new identity is connected with his new role as the redeemer of humanity who is able to reverse the sin of Adam. Before proceeding to the analysis of this theme in the Slavonic text and its connection with the Adamic tradition, a short excursus into the later Hekhalot materials is necessary.

Scholars have previously noted that in the additional chapters of *Sefer Hekhalot* Metatron appears to be viewed as a pre-existent being, first incarnated in Adam and then in Enoch, who re-ascends to the protoplast's heavenly home and takes his rightful place in the heights of the universe.[7] *3 Enoch* 48C:1 (§ 72 of Schäfer's edition) reads: «The Holy One, blessed be he, said: I made him strong, I took him, I appointed him, namely Metatron my servant (עבדי), who is unique among all the denizens of the heights… "I made him strong" in the generation of the first man (בדורו של אדם הראשון)…».[8]

[7] P. Alexander, From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch // Biblical Figures Outside the Bible / Ed. M. E. Stone, T. A. Bergen (Harrisburg, 1998) 102–104; M. Idel, Enoch is Metatron // *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–240.

[8] P. Alexander, 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 311; P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H. G. von Mutius, Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur (Tübingen, 1981) (TSAJ, 2) 36–37.

Scholars have noted that «Enoch here becomes a redeemer figure — a second Adam through whom humanity is restored».[9] This understanding of Enoch-Metatron as the Redeemer does not appear to be a later invention of the rabbinic and Hekhalot authors but can be already detected in *2 Slavonic Enoch*.

In chapter 64 of the Slavonic text an «astounding account» can be found which, in the view of one of *2 Enoch's* translators, «could hardly please a Jew or a Christian». The chapter depicts a prostration of «the elders of the people» and «all the community» before Enoch at the place of his second departure to heaven. The people who came to bow down before the patriarch delivered to Enoch the following address:

> O our father, Enoch! May you be blessed by the Lord, the eternal king! And now, bless your sons, and all the people, so that we may be glorified in front of your face today. For you will be glorified in front of the face of the Lord for eternity, because you are the one whom the Lord chose in preference to all the people upon the earth; and he appointed you to be the one who makes a written record of all his creation, visible and invisible, and the one who carried away the sin of humankind (*2 Enoch* 64:4–5).[10]

An important detail in this address is Enoch's designation as «the one who carried away the sin of humankind». This depiction of the patriarch as a redeemer is intriguing. But what kind of sin was Enoch able to carry away? Can it be merely related to Enoch's role as an intercessor for humans at the time of the final judgment? In this respect it is important that in *2 Enoch* 64 the «elders of the earth» define Enoch, not as the one who will carry away the sin of humankind, but as the one who has already carried away this sin. The emphasis on the already accomplished redemptive act provides an important clue to understanding the kind of sin Enoch was able to erase. The focus here is not on the individual sins of Enoch's descendents but on the primeval sin of humankind. Therefore, it becomes apparent that the redeeming functions of the patriarch are not related to his possible intercession for the sins of his children, the fallen angels or the «elders of the earth». Rather they pertain to the sin of the protoplast which the patriarch was able to «carry away» by his righteousness, ascension, and transformation. Yet Enoch's role in the economy of human salvation is not confined solely to his past encounter of the Face of God. In the Slavonic apocalypse he himself becomes a redeemer who is able to cause the transformation of human subjects. The significant detail of the aforementioned account in chapter 64 that unfolds Enoch's redeeming functions is that the same people who proclaim the patriarch as the redeemer

[9] Alexander, From Son of Adam to a Second God... 111.

[10] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 190.

of humanity now also find themselves prostrated before Enoch asking for his blessing so that they may be glorified in front of his face. *2 Enoch* 64 tells:

> And the elders of the people and all the community came and prostrated themselves and kissed Enoch. And they said to him, «O our father, Enoch! May you be blessed by the Lord, the eternal king! And now, bless your sons, and all the people, so that we may be glorified in front of your face today».[11]

This depiction recalls the earlier scene of the patriarch's approach to the *Kavod* in *2 Enoch* 22 where the visionary is depicted as prostrated before the Divine Face during his account of transformation. The only difference here is that instead of the Divine Face people are now approaching the Face of Enoch. It is intriguing that the shorter recension of *2 Enoch* 64 seems to attempt to portray the translated patriarch as a sort of replica or an icon of the Divine Face through which humans can access the Divine *Panim* and become glorified:

> And they kissed Enoch, saying, «Blessed is the Lord, the eternal king. Bless now your people, and glorify us to the face of the Lord. For the Lord has chosen you, to appoint you to be the one who reveals, who carries away our sins».[12]

In light of these theological developments taking place in the Slavonic apocalypse where the patriarch assumes the role of redeemer whose face is able to glorify human subjects, it is not coincidental that some manuscripts of *2 Enoch* confuse the glory of the Deity with the glory of the patriarch and the oil of the Lord with the oil of Enoch's head. These readings therefore appear to be not simply scribal slips but deliberate theological reworking in which Enoch's oil might be understood as having the same redeeming and transformative value as the oil of the Lord.

ABSTRACT

The study investigates the ritual of anointing with the oil of the resurrection found in *2 Enoch*. *2 Enoch* 22:9 portrays the archangel Michael anointing Enoch with delightful oil, the ointment of glory which transforms the patriarch into a celestial creature. According to some rabbinic materials this oil of the resurrection which is responsible for the change of human mortal nature into the glorious state of a celestial being will come at the eschatological time from the head of the Deity.

[11] *2 Enoch* 64:4 (the longer recension). Andersen, 2 Enoch… 190.

[12] *2 Enoch* 64:3–4 (the shorter recension). Andersen, 2 Enoch… 191.

Andrei A. Orlov
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

THE ORIGIN OF THE NAME «METATRON» AND THE TEXT OF *2 (SLAVONIC) ENOCH*[1]

The history of scholarship on *2 Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch* has produced no real consensus concerning the possible provenience of this apocalypse.[2] Rather, there are numerous scholarly positions.[3] These conclusions

[1] This study has benefited considerably from the comments and kindnesses of the following scholars who read the MS and preliminary materials at various stages: Christfried Böttrich, James Charlesworth, John Collins, April De Conick, Ian Fair, Everett Ferguson, Daniel Matt, André Resner, E. P. Sanders, Alan Segal, Carolyn Thompson, James Thompson, James VanderKam, Ben Zion Wacholder.

[2] F. I. Andersen in his English translation of *2 Enoch* notes that «there must be something very peculiar about a work when one scholar concludes that it was written by a hellenized Jew in Alexandria in the first century BCE while another argues that it was written by a Christian monk in Byzantium in the ninth century CE». See F. I. Andersen, 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 95.

[3] See Andersen, 2 Enoch…; F. Borsch, The Son of Man in Myth and History (Philadelphia, 1967); C. Böttrich, Das slavische Henochbuch (Gütersloh, 1995) (JSHRZ, 5); idem, Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch (Tübingen, 1992) (WUNT, 2/50); C. Burkitt, Jewish and Christian Apocalypses (London, 1914); R. H. Charles, The Date and Place of Writings of the Slavonic Enoch // *JTS* 22 (1921) 163; J. H. Charlesworth, The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research (Missoula, MT, 1976); J. Collins, The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism // Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East / Ed. D. Hellholm (Tübingen, 1983); L. Gry, Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Hénoch // *RB* 49 (1940) 195–203; J. Daniélou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity (Chicago, 1964); J. Fossum, Colossians 1.15–18a in the Light of Jewish Mysticism and Gnosticism // *NTS* 35 (1989) 183–201; K. Lake, The Date of the Slavonic Enoch // *HTR* 16 (1923) 397–398; M. McNamara, Intertestamental Literature (Wilmington, DE, 1983); Н. А. Мещерский, Следы памятников Кумрана в старославянской и древнерусской литературе (К изучению славянских версий книги Еноха // *Труды отдела древнерусской литературы* 19 (1963) 130–147; он же, К истории текста славянской книги Еноха (Следы памятников Кумрана в византийской и старославянской литературе // *BB* 24 (1964) 91–108; он же, К вопросу об источниках славянской книги Еноха // *Краткие сообщения Института народов Азии* 86 (1965) 72–78; J. T. Milik, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4 (Oxford, 1976); G. W. E. Nickelsburg, The Books of Enoch in Recent Research // *RSR* 7 (1981) 210–217; H. Odeberg, 3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch (New York, 1973); M. Philonenko, La cosmogonie du «Livre des secrets d'Hénoch // Religions en Égypte: Hellénistique et romaine (Paris, 1969); S. Pines, Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch // Types of

are most likely the consequences of the different backgrounds and perspectives which scholars have brought to their study of *2 Enoch*.

One of the important insights of research on *2 Enoch* is the view that the text has deep connections with so-called Merkabah mysticism.[4] Among the

Redemption / Ed. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, J. Jouco Bleeker (Leiden, 1970) (SHR, 18) 72–87; H. H. Rowley (ed.), A Companion to the Bible (Edinburgh, 1963); A. Rubinstein, Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch // *JJS* 15 (1962) 1–21; G. Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (New York, 1954); idem, Origins of the Kabbalah (Princeton, 1987); M. E. Stone, Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period (Assen—Philadelphia, 1984) (CRINT, 2.2) 2.406–408; A. Vaillant, Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française (Paris, 1952; repr. Paris, 1976); H. Wicks, The Doctrine of God in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature (New York, 1971).

[4] The term «Merkabah» is closely connected with the term which designates the mystical interpretation («*Maʿase Merkabah*» — «The Account of the Chariot» or «The Works of the Divine Chariot») of the first chapter of Ezekiel. Earliest traces of the Merkabah tradition are situated in apocalyptic and Qumran literature. However, as Gruenwald notes, the main corpus of the Merkabah literature was composed in Israel in the period 200–700 CE. Some references to this tradition can be found also in the literature of German Hasidim (twelfth to thirteenth centuries CE) and medieval Kabbalistic writings (the *Zohar*).

The term «Hekhalot» («Divine Palaces») designates the corpus of literature that first gives a full-scale presentation of Merkabah mysticism (the beginning of the tradition is connected with the circle of Rabbi Yohanan ben Zakkai and his pupils). According to Gruenwald the main subjects dealt with in the Hekhaloth literature are heavenly ascensions and the revelation of cosmological secrets. I. Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism (Leiden, 1980) (AGAJU, 14). The term «Merkabah» (the «Chariot») can be used also in its technical Kabbalistic meaning as the link between the physical and the divine worlds or as one of the upper worlds. On the Merkabah and the Hekhaloth traditions, see the following sources: D. Blumenthal, Understanding Jewish Mysticism: A Source Reader: The Merkabah Tradition and the Zoharic Tradition. 2 vols (New York, 1978); I. Chernus, Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism (Berlin, 1982) (SJ, 11); M. Cohen, The Shiʿur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism (Lanham, 1983); I. Gruenwald, M. Smith, The Hekhaloth Literature in English (Chico, CA, 1983); D. Halperin, The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision (Tübingen, 1988) (TSAJ, 16); D. Halperin, The Merkavah in Rabbinic Literature (New Haven, 1980); M. Idel, Enoch is Metatron // *Immanuel* 24–25 (1990) 220–240; L. Jacobs, Jewish Mystical Testimonies (New York, 1977); N. Janowitz, The Poetics of Ascent: Theories of Language in a Rabbinic Ascent Text (Albany, 1989); M. Morgan, Sepher Ha-Razim: The Book of Mysteries (Chico, CA, 1983) (TTPS, 11); P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H. G. von Mutius, Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur (Tübingen, 1981) (TSAJ, 2); P. Schäfer, The Hidden and Manifest God (Albany, 1992); G. Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition (New York, 1965); idem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (New York, 1954); M. Swartz, Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: An Analysis of Maʿaseh Merkavah (Tübingen, 1992) (TSAJ, 28).

leading pioneers of this approach stand Gershom Scholem and Hugo Odeberg.[5] Odeberg may well be the first scholar who pointed out that the descriptions of celestial titles for Enoch in *2 Enoch* are the most important evidences of possible connections between the apocalypse and texts of the Merkabah tradition.

In these descriptions of celestial titles, one may find the origins of another image of Enoch, quite distinct from early Enoch literature, which was later developed in Merkabah mysticism — the image of the angel Metatron, «The Prince of the Presence». The Slavonic text provides rudimentary descriptions of several traditional Merkabah titles of Enoch-Metatron, (e.g., «the Lad», «the Scribe», «the Prince of the World», «the Prince of the Presence»).[6] Keeping these manifestations of Merkabah symbolism in mind, this study will focus upon only one of these titles of Enoch, namely, «The Prince or the Governor of the World». The article will also explore some Slavonic terminology related to this title which may yield insight into the origin of the name «Metatron».

The Merkabah tradition stresses the role of Metatron as the «governing power over the nations, kingdoms and rulers on earth».[7] *Sefer Hekhalot* pictures Metatron as the Prince of the World, the leader of 72 princes of the kingdom of the world, who speaks (pleads) in favor of the world before the Holy One. Chapter 43 of the short recension of *2 Enoch* and a similar passage of the text of *2 Enoch* in the Slavonic collection «The Just Balance»[8] reveal Enoch in his new celestial role. Both texts outline Enoch's instructions to his children, during his brief return to the earth, in which he mentions his new role as the Governor or the Guide of the earth:

> And behold my children, I am the Governor of the earth, *p(r)ometaya* [п(р)ометаıа], I wrote (them) down. And the whole year I combined and the hours of the day. And the hours I measured: and I wrote down every seed on earth. And I compared every measure and the just balance I measured.[9]

An important aspect of both passages is the Slavonic term п(р)ометаıа (*prometaya*), which follows Enoch's title, «The Governor of the World».[10] This term was deliberately left in its original Slavonic form in order to preserve its authentic phonetic image. *Prometaya* represents an etymological

[5] Odeberg, 3 Enoch…; Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism…; idem, Origins of the Kabbalah…

[6] See A. Orlov, «Merkabah Stratum» of the Short Recention of 2 Enoch (M. A. Thesis; Abilene, 1995).

[7] Odeberg, 3 Enoch... 81.

[8] «The Just Balance» (*Мерило Праведное*) is the Slavonic collection of ethical writings in which the existence of *2 Enoch* was made public. See М. Н. Тихомиров, Мерило Праведное по рукописи XIV века (Москва, 1961).

[9] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 217–219.

[10] Andersen translates the title as «the manager of the arrangements on earth». Andersen, 2 Enoch… 217.

enigma for experts in Slavonic, since it is found solely in the text of *2 Enoch*. It should be stressed again that there is no other Slavonic text where the word *prometaya* is documented.

The prominent Russian linguist I. Sreznevskij, in his Slavonic dictionary, which is still considered by scholars as a primary tool of Slavonic etymology, was unable to provide a definition for *prometaya*.[11] He simply put a question mark in the space for the meaning of the word.[12] The variety of readings for this term in the manuscripts of *2 Enoch*[13] shows similar «linguistic embarrassment» among Slavic scribes who most likely had some difficulties discerning the meaning of this ambiguous term. The readings of other manuscripts include *promitaya, prometaemaa, pometaya, pametaa.*

One possible explanation for the singular occurrence of *prometaya* is that the word may actually be a Greek term that was left untranslated in the original text for some unknown reason. In fact, *2 Enoch* contains a number of transliterated Hebrew and Greek words preserved in their original phonetic form (e.g., *Grigori, Ophanim, Raqia Araboth).* But if we investigate the term *prometaya* more closely, the root *meta* draws our attention nesessitating further examination of the relationship between the words *prometaya* and *metatron.*

Contemporary scholarship does not furnish a consensus concerning the origin of the name «Metatron». In scholarly literature, there are several independent hypotheses about the provenance of the term. I want to draw our attention to one possible interpretation, which could be connected with some materials in *2 Enoch.* According to this interpretation, the name «Metatron» may be derived from the Greek word μέτρον (measure, rule). Adolf Jellinek may well be the first scholar who suggested μέτρον as an alternative explanation of Metatron, on the assumption that Metatron was identical with Horos.[14] Gedaliahu Stroumsa in his article, «Forms of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ», gives some convincing new reasons for the acceptance of this etymology, on the basis that Metatron not only carried God's name, but also measured Him; he was His *Shi'ur Qomah* (the measurement of the Divine Body).[15] In light of this observation, Stroumsa stresses that «renewed

[11] On the other hand, Vaillant in his edition states that *prometaya* could be identified as a rare verb corresponding to the Greek βασανίζων. The linguistic source of this suggestion remains unknown. Andersen criticizes this translation, pointing out that the meaning is not quite suitable and does not correspond to earlier materials. See Andersen, 2 Enoch… 217.

[12] «**промитати, промитаꙗ** (*promitati, promitaja*) — ?». И. И. Срезневский, Словарь древнерусского языка (Москва, 1989) Т. 2. 1544.

[13] Andersen stresses that the variations show «theological embarassment» among the Slavic scribes (Andersen, 2 Enoch… 217).

[14] Odeberg, 3 Enoch… 134.

[15] G. G. Stroumsa, Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ // *HTR* 76 (1983) 287.

attention should be given to μέτρον and/or *metator* as a possible etymology of Metatron».[16]

Matthew Black, in his short article devoted to the origin of the name Metatron, expounds upon an additional etymological facet of this interpretation of the name. He traces the origin of the name to a previously unnoticed piece of evidence which can be found in Philo's[17] *Quaest. in Gen.*, where, among other titles of the Logos, Black finds the term *praemetitor*.[18] He further suggests that *praemetitor* could be traced to the Greek term μετρητής,[19] the Greek equivalent of the Latin *metator*, «measurer», applied to the Logos.[20]

The term *praemetitor* in its hypothetical meaning as a «measurer» is an important piece of evidence because it is almost phonetically identical with the Slavonic term *prometaya*.

Additionally, the term *prometaya* is incorporated into the passage which describes Enoch as the Measurer of the Lord. In ch. 43 of *2 Enoch*, immediately after the use of this term, Enoch makes the following statement:

> I have arranged the whole year. And from the year I calculated the months, and from the months I calculated the days, and from the day I calculated the hours. I have measured[21] and noted the hours. And I have distinguished every seed on the earth, and every measure[22] and every righteous scale. I have measured[23] and recorded them.[24]

A similar passage in the previously mentioned collection, «The Just Balance» also emphasizes the functions of Enoch as the measurer:

> And the whole year I combined, and the hours of the day. And the hours I measured: and I wrote down every seed on earth. And I compared every measure and the just balance I measured. And I wrote (them) down, just as the Lord commanded. And in everything I discovered differences.[25]

---

[16] Stroumsa, Form(s) of God... 287.

[17] The idea that the Metatron figure originally came into Judaism from Philo's Logos speculations was popular in German scholarship of the 19th century. Cf. M. Friedländer, Der vorchristliche Jüdische Gnostizismus (Göttingen, 1898); M. Grünbaum, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sprach-und Sagenkunde (Berlin, 1901); M. Sachs, Beiträge zur Sprach-und Alterthums-forschung (Berlin, 1852); N. Weinstein, Zur Genesis der Agada (Göttingen, 1901).

[18] M. Black, The Origin of the Name Metatron // *VT* 1 (1951) 218.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

[21] **измѣриⷯ.**

[22] **мѣрꙋ.**

[23] **измѣриⷯ.**

[24] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 171.

[25] Ibid. 217.

These two passages echo the passage from Philo's *Quaest. in Gen.* which discusses the Divine Logos as the «just measure»:

> And «Gomorra», «measure» true and just is the Divine Logos, by which have been measured and are measured all things that are on earth — principles, numbers and proportions in harmony and consonance being included, through which the form and measures of existing things are seen.[26]

The text of *2 Enoch* uses the identical term «just measure» (**мѣра правєдна**), immediately after the passage dedicated to the function of Enoch as a measurer.

In addition to Stroumsa's suggestion about possible connections between «the measurer» and «the measurement of divine body», it is noteworthy that there is another hypothetical link between the functions of Enoch-Metatron as «the measurer» and his «measurement» of human sin for final judgement in the text of *2 Enoch*. Following Enoch's introduction as «the measure», the text mentioned the «measurer» of each person for final judgment:

> ...in the great judgement day every measure and weight in the market will be exposed, and each one will recognize his own measure, and in it he will receive his reward.... Before humankind existed, a place of judgment, ahead of time, was prepared for them, and scales and weights by means of which a person will be tested.[27]

A second possible interpretation of the term *prometaya* can be traced to Enoch's title, «Governor of the World», after which the Slavonic term *prometaya* occurs. It can be assumed that *prometaya* in this situation is a Greek word, which is somehow connected with this title. Possible hypothetical Greek prototypes of *prometaya* could be προμήθεια (προμηθεύς, προμηθέομαι), in the sense of protection, care, or providence, which could be directly related to the preceding title of Enoch — the Governor, or the Guide of the earth — «I am the Governor of the earth, *prometaya*, I have written them down».

In conclusion, it is important to note that *prometaya* could represent a very early, rudimentary form of the title that later was transformed into the term «metatron». In relation to this, Gershom Scholem, in his analysis of the term «metatron», shows that the reduplication of the letter *tet* (ט) and the ending *ron* represent a typical pattern that runs through all Merkabah texts. In his opinion, «both the ending and the repetition of the consonant are observable, for instance, in names like Zohariel and Adiriron».[28] Further, he stresses that it must also be borne in mind that *on* and *ron* may have been fixed and typical constituents of secret names rather than meaningful syllables.[29]

[26] Philo, *Quaest. in Gen.* 4.23.

[27] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 219.

[28] Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism... 69

[29] Ibid. 69–70.

Thus, keeping in mind the possible date of *2 Enoch* in the first century of the common era before the destruction of the Second Temple, *prometaya* could be one of the earliest traces connecting the names Enoch and Metatron.[30]

ABSTRACT

The study examines the mysterious Slavonic term *prometaya* found in *2 Enoch* 34 arguing that it could represent a very early, rudimentary form of the name «Metatron»

[30] On the hypothetical date of *2 Enoch* see: Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism… 17; Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism… 50.

Andrei A. Orlov
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

TITLES OF ENOCH-METATRON IN 2 (SLAVONIC) ENOCH[1]

> Whoever is dealing with the Account of Creation and the Account of the Chariot must inevitably fail. It is therefore written, «Let this heap of ruins be under your hand» (Isa. 3.6). This refers to things that a person can not understand, unless he fails in them.
>
> (The *Book of Bahir*, 150)

In his introduction to the English translation of *2 Enoch* F. I. Andersen states that «all attempts[2] to locate the intellectual background of the book

---

[1] Part of this paper was read at the Annual Meeting of SBL/AAR, New Orleans, 23–26 November 1996.

[2] On different approaches to *2 Enoch*, cf. И. Д. Амусин, Тексты Кумрана (Москва, 1971) (Памятники письменности востока, 33/I); F. I. Andersen, 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 91–221; C. Böttrich, Adam als Mikrokosmos: Eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch (Frankfurt am Main, 1995) (Judentum und Umwelt, 59); idem, Das slavische Henochbuch (Gütersloh, 1995) (JSHRZ, 5); idem, Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult; Studien zum slavische Henochbuch (Tübingen, 1992) (WUNT, 2/50); R. H. Charles, The Date and Place of Writings of the Slavonic Enoch // *JTS* 22 (1921) 161–163 (163); J. H. Charlesworth, In the Crucible: The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Interpretation // Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation / Ed. J. H. Charlesworth, C. A. Evans (Sheffield, 1993) (JSPSS, 14) 20–43; J. H. Charlesworth, The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament: Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins (Cambridge, 1985) (SNTSMS, 54); idem, The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research with a Supplement (Chico, CA, 1981) (SBLSCS, 7); J. Collins, The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism // Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East / Ed. D. Hellholm (Tübingen, 1983); L. Gry, Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Hénoch // *RB* 49 (1940) 195–203; J. Daniélou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity (Chicago, 1964); U. Fischer, Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum (Berlin, 1978) (BZNW, 44); J. Fossum, Colossians 1.15–18a in the Light of Jewish Mysticism and Gnosticism // *NTS* 35 (1989) 183–201; K. Lake, The Date of the Slavonic Enoch // *HTR* 16 (1923) 397–398; Н. А. Мещерский, Следы памятников Кумрана в старославянской и древнерусской литературе (К изучению славянских версий книги Еноха) // *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 19 (1963) 130–147; он же, К истории текста славянской книги Еноха (Следы памятников Кумрана в византийской и старославянской литературе) // *BB* 24

have failed».[3] Among these endeavors were several efforts to establish the connection between *2 Enoch* and *Maᶜaseh Merkabah*.[4] One of the essential

(1964) 91–108; он же, К вопросу об источниках славянской Книги Еноха // *Краткие Сообщения Института Народов Азии* 86 (1965) 72–78; J. T. Milik, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4 (Oxford, 1976); G. W. E. Nickelsburg, The Books of Enoch in Recent Research // *RSR* 7 (1981) 210–217: H. Odeberg, 3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch (New York, 1973); M. Philonenko, La cosmogonie du «Livre des secrets d'Hénoch» // Religions en Égypte: Hellénistique et romaine (Paris, 1969); S. Pines, Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch // Types of Redemption / Ed. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, J. Jouco Bleeker (Leiden, 1970) (SHR, 18) 72–87; J. Reeves, Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library // Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha / Ed. J. C. Reeves (Atlanta, CA, 1994) (EJL, 6) 173–203: A. Rubinstein, Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch // *JJS* 15 (1962) 1–21; G. Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (New York, 1954); idem, On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead (New York, 1991); idem, Origins of the Kabbalah (Princeton, NJ, 1987); M. Scopello, The Apocalypse of Zostrianos (Nag Hammadi VIII.1) and the Book of the Secrets of Enoch // *VC* 34 (1980) 367–385; M. E. Stone, Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period (Assen—Philadelphia, 1984) (CRINT, 2.2) 2. 406–408; A. Vaillant, Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française (Paris, 1952; repr. Paris, 1976); J. VanderKam, Enoch, A Man for All Generations (Columbia, 1995).

[3] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 95.

[4] On the Merkabah tradition, see the following sources: P. Alexander, The Historical Settings of the Hebrew Book of Enoch // *JJS* 28 (1977) 156–180; D. Blumenthal, Understanding Jewish Mysticism, a Source Reader: The Merkabah Tradition and the Zoharic Tradition. 2 vols (New York, 1978); I. Chernus, Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism (Berlin, 1982) (SJ, 11); M. Cohen, The Shiᶜur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism (Lanham, 1983); J. Greenfield, Prolegomenon // Odeberg, 3 Enoch… xi–xlvii; I. Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism (Leiden, 1980) (AGJU, 14); I. Gruenwald, M. Smith, The Hekhaloth Literature in English (Chico, CA, 1983); D. Halperin, The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision (Tübingen, 1988) (TSAJ, 16); idem, The Merkavah in Rabbinic Literature (New Haven, 1980); M. Idel, Enoch is Metatron // *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–240; L. Jacobs, Jewish Mystical Testimonies (New York, 1977); N. Janowitz, The Poetics of Ascent: Theories of Language in a Rabbinic Ascent Text (Albany, 1989); M. Morgan, Sepher Ha-Razim: The Book of Mysteries (Chico, CA, 1983) (TTPS, 11); C. Morray-Jones, Hekhaloth Literature and Talmudic Tradition: Alexander's Three Test Cases // *JJS* 22 (1991) 1–39; C. Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition (Atlanta, GA, 1985) (HSS, 27); P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H. G. von Mutius, Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur (Tübingen, 1981) (TSAJ, 2); P. Schäfer, The Hidden and Manifest God (Albany, 1992); P. Schäfer et al., Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literatur. 4 vols (Tübingen, 1987–1995) (TSAJ, 17, 22, 29, 46); G. Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition (New York, 1965); idem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (New York, 1954); N. Séd, Les traditions secrètes et les disciples de Rabban Yohannan ben Zak-

contributors to this approach, Hugo Odeberg[5] points out that the similarities in descriptions of celestial titles for Enoch in *2* and *3 Enoch* may be the important evidence of a possible connection between *2 Enoch* and texts of the Merkabah tradition.

The purpose of this chapter is to call attention to some details of these descriptions which might shed new light on the relationship between early Enochic[6] and Merkabah traditions.

The Prince of the Presence

The substantial part of *2 Enoch's* narrative is dedicated to Enoch's ascent into the celestial realm and to his heavenly metamorphosis near the Throne of Glory. In these lengthy and elaborated descriptions of Enoch's transformation into a celestial being, on a level with the archangels, one may find the origin of another image of Enoch which was developed later in Merkabah mysticism, that is, the image of the angel Metatron, the Prince of the Presence.

Odeberg may well be the first scholar to have discovered the characteristics of «the Prince of the Presence» in the long recension of *2 Enoch*. He successfully demonstrated in his synopsis of the parallel passages from *2* and *3 Enoch*, that the phrase «stand before my face forever»[7] does not serve merely

---

kai // *RHR* 184 (1973) 49–66; M. Swartz, Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: An Analysis of Maʿaseh Merkavah (Tübingen, 1992) (TSAJ, 28).

[5] Odeberg, 3 Enoch…

[6] On the figure of Enoch and Enochic traditions see: M. Black, The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes (Leiden, 1985) (SVTP, 7); Charlesworth, The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament…; idem, The Pseudepigrapha…; J. Collins, The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity (New York, 1984) 33–67; P. Grelot, La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: son origine et signification // *RSR* 46 (1958) 5–26, 181–210; H. L. Jansen, Die Henochgestalt: Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung (Oslo, 1939) (Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1); H. Kvanvig, Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man (Neukirchen—Vluyn, 1988) (WMANT, 61); Milik, The Books of Enoch…; Odeberg, 3 Enoch…; M. Stone, Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha with Special Reference to Armenian Tradition (Leiden, 1991); M. Stone, The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century BCE // *CBQ* 40 (1978) 479–492; J. VanderKam, Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources // *SBLSP* (1978) 1. 229–251; idem, Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition (Washington, 1984) (CBQMS, 16); idem, Enoch, A Man for All Generations… On Merkabah features of Enochic traditions, see P. Alexander, 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 247–248; Greenfield, Prolegomenon… xvi–xxi; Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism… 32–51.

[7] **стани пред лицемъ моимь во вѣкъı.**

as a normal Hebraism «to be in the presence», but establishes the angelic status of Enoch as Metatron, the Prince of the Presence, שר הפנים.[8]

The title itself is developed mainly in chs. 21–22, which are dedicated to the description of the Throne of Glory. In these chapters, one finds many promises that Enoch will «stand in front of the face of the Lord forever».[9]

In terms of the theological background of the problem, the title seems connected with the image of Metatron in the Merkabah tradition,[10] which was «crystallized in the classical Hekhalot literature».[11] According to the legend of the Hekhalot tradition, Enoch «was raised to the rank of first of the angels and שר הפנים (literally, 'prince of the divine face', or 'divine presence')».[12] *3 Enoch*, as well as other texts of the tradition, have a well-developed theology connected with this title.

The Knower of Secrets

The Merkabah tradition emphasizes the role of Metatron as the «Knower of Secrets», יודע רזים.[13] According to *3 Enoch* he is «wise in the secrets and Master of the mysteries».[14] He is the one who received these secrets from the angels and from the Lord (the Holy One). He serves also as «the Revealer of Secrets», the one who is responsible for the transmission of the highest secrets to the Princes under him, as well as to humankind. In ch. 38 of *3 Enoch*, Metatron told R. Ishmael that he was the person who revealed secrets to Moses, in spite of the protests of heavenly hosts:

> ... when I revealed this secret to Moses, then all the host in every heaven on high raged against me and said to me: Why do you reveal this secret to a son of man... the secret by which were created heaven and earth... and the Torah and Wisdom and Knowledge and Thought and the Gnosis of things above and the fear of heaven. Why do you reveal this to flesh and blood?[15]

According to this theological material, Enoch (Metatron) is responsible for transmitting the secrets of the Written Torah as well as the Oral Tradition. «And Metatron brought them out from his house of treasuries and committed

[8] Odeberg, 3 Enoch... 1.55.

[9] Cf. 21:3; 21:5; 22:6; 22:7.

[10] Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism... 67.

[11] About different stages in the Hekhalot tradition, see Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism... 67; 98–123.

[12] Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism... 67.

[13] The origin of the role in Enochic traditions can be traced to *1 Enoch* 72:1; 74:2 and 80:1. See also 41:1, «And after this I saw all secrets of heaven». M. Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch. 2 vols (Oxford, 1978) Vol. 2. 128.

[14] Odeberg, 3 Enoch... 2.30.

[15] Ibid. 2.177–178.

them to Moses, and Moses to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the prophets and the prophets to the men of the Great Synagogue…».[16]

In later Merkabah materials, Enoch-Metatron is the guide and the revealer of secrets to all who are initiated into the account of the Chariot.[17] Hekhalot literature (*3 Enoch*, the *Shiʿur Qomah* materials) describes these functions of Metatron. He guides and reveals secrets to R. Ishmael and to R. Akiba. Sometimes the Merkabah narrative extends his role to the titles of the Prince of Wisdom and the Prince of Understanding.[18]

It is apparent that in *2 Enoch* one may see some kind of preparation of Enoch for his role as Metatron, «the Knower of Secrets». The preparation entails several stages. First, the archangel Vereveil inducts Enoch into these secrets. He instructs Enoch in «all the deeds of the Lord, the earth and the sea, and all the elements and the courses…and the Hebrew language, every kind of language of the new song of the armed troops and everything that it is appropriate to learn» (23:1–2). Second, the Lord himself continues to instruct him in the secrets, which he had not even explained to the angels (24:3). Finally, the Lord promised Enoch the role of «Knower of Secrets». The important detail here is that the promise of the role is closely connected with other titles of Metatron such as the Prince of Presence, the Heavenly Scribe, and the Witness of the Judgment. In the text the Lord promised:

> …and you will be in front of my face from now and forever.[19] And you will be seeing my secrets[20] and you will be scribe for my servants[21] since you will be writing down everything that has happened on earth and that exists on earth and in the heavens, and you will be for me a witness of the judgment[22] of the great age (36:3).

This substantial passage graphically depicts the interrelation of the future roles of Enoch-Metatron in the narrative of *2 Enoch*. In spite of the fact that the text does not elaborate the real embodiments of these roles and titles, but only promises and initiations in these roles, it leaves the impression that *2 Enoch* is part of the larger tradition and that its author has prior knowledge of the future development of these titles and the deeds behind them.

---

[16] Odeberg, 3 Enoch… 2.178.

[17] Metatron himself was the Merkabah mystic *par excellence* and a good example for *Yorde Merkabah*. As Alexander notes, it is not hard to see why he attracted mystics. «He was a human being who had been elevated over all the angels, and was living proof that man could overcome angelic opposition and approach God. He was a powerful "friend at court"». Alexander, 3 Enoch… 244.

[18] Odeberg, 3 Enoch… 2.30.

[19] «The Prince of the Presence».

[20] «The Knower of Secrets».

[21] «The Heavenly Scribe».

[22] «The Witness of the Divine Judgment».

It is intriguing that the narrative of *2 Enoch* does not show the promised powerful deeds of Enoch-Metatron in different offices of the heavenly realm, for example, those of the Knower, the Scribe, the Witness and the Prince of Presence even in early «primitive» Merkabah or apocalyptic form. It looks as if the author of the text deliberately avoids these details. He knows that it is not time for revealing these facts. Enoch must return to the earth, and only after that trip he will fully assume his heavenly offices. In 67:2, which serves as the conclusion to Enoch's story, there is a statement about the theme: «and the Lord received him and made him stand in front of his face for eternity».[23]

In this regard, the narratives of *2 Enoch* and *3 Enoch* seem to be written from different temporal perspectives. The setting of Enoch's story in *2 Enoch* is the antediluvian period. Melchizedek's narrative of the book distinctively stresses this point. This explains why in *2 Enoch* «there is no place for Abraham, Moses, and the rest».[24]

The Heavenly Scribe

Odeberg notices that Enoch's initiation into the Secrets (and his title — the Knower of Secrets) is closely connected with his scribal activities[25] and with his other title — «the Scribe»[26] (סופר) or «the Heavenly Scribe».[27] The steps in the development of this theme in *2 Enoch* are apparent. Enoch's scribal functions have several aspects:

1. He was initiated into the scribal activities by the Lord himself. «And the Lord said to Vereveil, "Bring out the books from the storehouses, and

[23] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 195.

[24] Ibid. 196.

[25] In early Enochic traditions these two functions are also unified. The motif of initiation into the secrets as the beginning of scribal activities occupies a substantial role in the Astronomical Book of *1 Enoch*, the oldest Enochic material. In *1 Enoch* 74:2 Enoch writes the instructions of the angel Uriel regarding the secrects of heavenly bodies and their movements. Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 2. 173. Qumran Enochic fragments (4QEnGiants 14; 4QEn 92:1) picture Enoch as «the scribe of distinction» ספר פרשא. Cf. Milik, The Book of Enoch… 261–262 and 305. In the book of *Jubilees* Enoch is attested as «the first who learned writings and knowledge and wisdom… And who wrote in the book the signs of the heaven». O. S. Wintermute, Jubilees // OTP. Vol. 2. 62.

[26] The origin of the title in Enochic traditions can be traced to the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 Enoch* 12:4, 15:1), where Enoch is named as «a scribe of righteousness». Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 2. 92 and 100. According to Black the possible biblical parallel to Enoch's role as the Scribe could be the passage from Ezek. 9, which pictures man clad in white linen with an ink-horn by his side. Black, *The Book of Enoch*, 143.

[27] Odeberg, 3 Enoch… 1.56.

give a pen to Enoch[28] and read him the books". And Vereveil… gave me the pen[29] from his hand» (22:11).[30]

2. He writes down the mysteries which were explained to him by angels. In 23:4 angel Vereveil commands him: «Write everything that I have explained to you».[31]

3. The results of his scribal activity were a certain number of books. «I wrote accurately. And I expounded 300 and 60 books» (23:6).[32]

4. The Lord instructed Enoch to deliver these books in his handwriting to his sons,[33] and to distribute the books in his handwriting to his children… for they will read them from generation to generation (33:8–10).

5. The Lord appointed the guardian angels for Enoch's writings:

> For I will give you an intercessor, Enoch, my archistratig, Michael, on account of your handwritings and the handwritings of your fathers — Adam and Seth. They will not be destroyed until the final age. For I have commanded my angels Arioch and Marioch, whom I have appointed on the earth to guard them and to command the things of time to preserve the handwritings of your fathers so that they might not perish in the impending flood which I will create in your generation (33:10–12.)[34]

The motif of the guardian angels of the books is very specific for the esoterism of Merkabah tradition.[35] This motif can be found in *3 Enoch* as well as in other texts of the tradition.

6. Finally the Lord gave the promise to Enoch about his future role as the Heavenly Scribe when he will return to heaven after the instructions of his sons, «…and you will be the scribe[36] for my servants, since you will be writing down everything that has happened on earth and that exists on earth and in the heavens, and you will be for me a witness of the judgment of the great age» (36:3).[37]

---

[28] вдаи же трость Ѳноховι.

[29] вдасть ми трость.

[30] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 141.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid.

[33] In *1 Enoch* 81:6 the angel Uriel commands to Enoch: «teach your children, and write (these things) down for them, and testify to all your children». Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 2. 187.

[34] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 157.

[35] Alexander notes that «classic rabbinical literature makes it clear that there was an esoteric doctrine in Talmudic Judaism. It was concerned with two subjects — the Account of Creation (*Maᶜaseh Berešit*) and the Account of the Chariot (*Maᶜaseh Merkabah*). All study and discussion of these topics in public was banned». Alexander, 3 Enoch… 229–230.

[36] книжник.

[37] It is an important moment for understanding of the presence of Merkabah tradition in the text of *2 Enoch*: the functions of Enoch as the Scribe will be connected

Finally, it is worth examining an interesting detail that is relevant as a characteristic of a hypothetical provenance, but which has remained unnoticed by scholars. In 23:4, when Enoch was already in the highest realms, Vereveil gave him permission to sit down.[38] «You sit down; write everything…». And Enoch said, «And I sat down[39] for a second period of 30 days and 30 nights, and I wrote accurately» (23:6).[40] It is important to notice that Vereveil's suggestion that Enoch be seated occurs after Enoch has been «brought in front of the face of the Lord» (22:6), and after he has been invited by the Lord «to stand in front of his face forever» (22.6–7). According to rabbinic tradition, «there is no sitting in heaven».[41] An allegorical description, which can be found in *3 Enoch*, depicts God as the one who places Metatron on a throne at the door of the Seventh Hall.[42] In his commentary on this section of *3 Enoch*, Odeberg states that «assigning a seat or a throne to any angel-prince or to any one beside the Holy One, might endanger the recognition of the absolute sovereignty and unity of the Godhead».[43] Furthermore, he reasoned that according to rabbinic tradition the privilege of «sitting» was accorded to Metatron by virtue of his character as «scribe», for he was granted permission as a scribe «to sit and write down the merits of Israel».[44] This fact, that Enoch was seated in the text of *2 Enoch*, is one more compelling example that further strengthens the hypothesis regarding the connection of the text of *2 Enoch* with the Merkabah tradition.

The Youth

Previous research has shown that the descriptions of the celestial titles in *2 Enoch* occupy some sort of intermediate position between early Enochic traditions and the Metatron tradition. Therefore, some later titles of Metatron, which are absent in *1 Enoch, Jubilees* and the Qumran materials are presented in the narrative of *2 Enoch.* A good illustration of this situation could be the observation of another celestial title of Enoch-Metatron which

with his role as the Witness of the Divine Judgment: «Metatron sits and judges the heavenly household» or «Metatron, the angel of the Presence, stands at the door of the Palace of God and he sits and judges all the heavenly hosts before his Master. And God pronounces judgment and he executes it». Odeberg, 3 Enoch… 2.171.

[38] ⰑⰰⰆⰻ.

[39] ⰑⰋⰰⰟⰧ.

[40] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 141.

[41] *b*. Hag. 15a.

[42] 3 En. 10.

[43] Odeberg, 3 Enoch… 2.27.

[44] Ibid.

can be found in *2 Enoch*, namely — *Naʿar* נער, which can be translated as the Youth or the Lad.[45]

According to Jewish mystical lore, this title could be considered as «proof» of the theological assumption that Metatron is the translated Enoch ben Yared. The tradition derives this title from the exegesis of Prov. 22.6 (חנך ל נער), which was interpreted as «Enoch was made into the *Naʿar*, i.e. Metatron».[46]

The title «Youth» in the Merkabah tradition has several possible theological meanings. According to one of them, the name may be explained by the fact that Metatron grows old, and is then constantly rejuvenated.[47] Another possible explanation is that he is young in comparison with other angels-princes who existed from the beginning.[48] It is notable, that the several important occurrences of the title «Youth» in the text of *2 Enoch* come from the mouths of angels. In chapter 9 of the short recension an angelic being, who is accompanying Enoch on his way through the heavenly realm, addresses Enoch as «Youth»: «This place has been prepared, Youth (юноше), for the righteous….[49] Later in chapter 10 we can hear the same address again: «This place, Youth (юноше), has been prepared for those who practice godless uncleanness on the earth…»[50] These occurrences could be considered by someone simply as reminders for Enoch about his novice status in the heavenly realm. This, however, is not the case with the Merkabah tradition, where *Naʿar* also designates special relationships between the Holy One and Metatron. In *3 Enoch* when R. Ishmael asks Metatron «What is your name?» Metatron answers, «I have seventy names, corresponding to the seventy tongues of the world… but my King calls me «Youth» (*Naʿar*)».[51] Interestingly enough, we can see the beginning of this tradition in the text of *2 Enoch*. In chapter 24 of the short recension[52] we read: «And the Lord called me (Enoch) and he placed me to himself closer than Gabriel. And the Lord spoke to me "What-

[45] According to Tishby it is the most popular title of Metatron. «Metatron is known by many names and titles, but his regular designation, found even in the earlier literature, is נער, *naʿar* — «boy», or «lad». I. Tishby, The Wisdom of the Zohar: Anthology of Texts. 3 vols (London, 1994) Vol. 2. 628.

[46] Odeberg, 3 Enoch… 1.119.

[47] Tishby, The Wisdom of the Zohar… Vol. 2. 628: «it is the mystery of the boy who reaches old age and then reverts to his youth as at the beginning».

[48] Odeberg, 3 Enoch… 1.80.

[49] Barsov's manuscript [B], ch. V in М. И. Соколов, Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий, VII: Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного / Тексты, латинский пер. и исследование. Посмертный труд автора приготовил к изд. М. Сперанский // *ЧОИДР* 4 (1910) 85.

[50] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 119.

[51] Odeberg, 3 Enoch… 2.6–7.

[52] On Merkabah stratum of the shorter recension see A. Orlov, «Merkabah Stratum» of the Short Recension of 2 Enoch (M. A. Thesis; Abilene, 1995).

ever you see, Youth (**юноше**), things standing still and moving about were brought to perfection by me. And not even to my angels have I explained my secrets… as I am making them known to you today"».[53] As we can see in the passage the title «Youth» stresses the unique role of Enoch-Metatron among other archangels-princes, despite his young angelic age.

In spite of the abundance of the information about *Naʿar* in Merkabah literature, the title itself, in many respects, remains a mysterious theological puzzle. Perhaps the most mysterious thing connected with this title is the fact that prominent scholars of Jewish mystical literature like Scholem and Odeberg do not find the important title in the narrative of *2 Enoch*. One possible explanation may be that Vaillant did not pay enough attention to the variants of the reading of the term «Youth» in his edition, considering this reading as a «corruption»,[54] and consequently dedicating just a few sentences to this fact. According to Vaillant this «corruption» occurred because the Slavonic word **ѳноше**, the vocative form of «Enoch», is very similar to «Youth», **юноше**.[55] This probably explains why those scholars who based their research on Vaillant's text also missed this vital point. Only the new collation of manuscripts for Andersen's translation again drew attention to this variant. Andersen gives a short concluding note on the term «Youth» that «It cannot be a coincidence that this title is identical with that of Enoch (= Metatron) in *3 Enoch*».[56]

The Governor of the World

The Merkabah tradition stresses the role of Metatron as «governing power over the nations, kingdoms and rulers on earth».[57] Chapter 30 of *3 Enoch* pictures Metatron as the Prince of the World שר העולם, the leader of seventy-two princes of the kingdom of the world, who speaks (pleads) in favor of the world before the Holy One.[58] Odeberg notes that «the Prince of the World

[53] Barsov's manuscript [B], ch. XI in Соколов, Материалы и заметки... VII: Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного… 90–91.

[54] Andersen criticizes Valliant's position. He stresses that «the similarity to the vocative *enoše* might explain the variant as purely scribal slip. But it is surprising that it is only in address, never in description, that the term is used. The variant *jenokhu* is rare. There is no phonetic reason why the first vowel should change to ju; *junokhu* is never found». Andersen, 2 Enoch… 118–119.

[55] Cf. Vaillant, Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch... 8.

[56] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 119. Sreznevskij's dictionary equates the Slavonic word **юноше** with Greek νεανίσκος. Cf. И. И. Срезневский, Словарь древнерусского языка. 3 тт. (Москва, 1989) Т. 2. 1627–1628.

[57] Odeberg, 3 Enoch… 1.81.

[58] Ibid. 2.105. In chapter 48 of *3 Enoch* the Holy One says that he «committed unto him (Metatron) 70 angels corresponding to the nations (of the world) and gave

in *3 Enoch* combines the function of the rulers of the nations: they plead each one the cause of his nation, the Prince of the World pleads the cause of all nations together, of the world in its entirety».[59]

Both chapter 43 of the short recension of *2 Enoch* and a similar passage of the text of *2 Enoch* in a Slavonic collection «The Just Balance»[60] reveal Enoch in his new celestial role. The texts outline Enoch's instructions to his children during his brief return to the earth in which he mentions his new role as the Governor of the earth:

> And behold my children, I am the Governor[61] of the earth, I wrote (them) down. And the whole year I combined and the hours of the day.[62] And the hours I measured: and I wrote down every seed on earth. And I compared every measure and the just balance I measured. And I wrote (them) down, just as the Lord commanded... the doings of each person will put down, and no one will hide, because the Lord is the one who pays, and He will be the avenger on the great judgment day.[63]

The interesting parallel here to *3 Enoch* is the fact that the role of Enoch-Metatron as the Governor (Prince) of the World is closely connected in both texts with the theme of Divine Judgment and with Metatron's role in that process as the Witness of the Judgment.[64] As we recall in *3 Enoch* these two

---

into his charge all the household above and below... and arranged for him all the works of Creation», Ibid. 166.

[59] Odeberg, 3 Enoch... 2.105.

[60] «The Just Balance» (*Мерило Праведное*) is the Slavonic collection of ethical writings in which the existence of *2 Enoch* first was made public. Cf. М. Н. Тихомиров, Мерило Праведное по рукописи XIV века (Москва, 1961).

[61] Majority of manuscripts use Slavonic words **кръмьствоуемаꙗ** or **кормьствоуемаꙗ**. I. Sreznevskij in his dictionary relates these Slavonic terms to the Greek word κυβέρνησις or the Latin *gubernatio*. Cf. Срезневский, Словарь древнерусского языка... Т. 1. 1410. The manuscripts of «*Мерило Праведное*» [MPr] use the word *pravlemaya*. Cf. Тихомиров, Мерило Праведное... 71. Andersen translates the term as «manager» — «I am the manager of the arrangements on earth...». Andersen, 2 Enoch... 217.

[62] See the similar functions of Enoch in the *Book of Jubilees* where he «appointed times of the years according to their order, with respect to each of their months... And their weeks according to jubilees he recounted; and the days of the years he made known. And the months he set in order, and the sabbaths of the years he recounted», Wintermute, Jubilees... 62–63.

[63] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 217–219.

[64] The rudimentary traces of this tradition can be found in other documents of early Enochic literature: in *1 Enoch, Aramaic Levi,* and in the *Book of Jubilees,* where Enoch is pictured as the one «who saw what was and what will happen among the children of men in their generations until the day of judgment. He saw and knew everything and wrote his testimony and deposited the testimony upon the earth against

themes — governing of the world and pleading for the world — remained connected together: Metatron is the Prince of the World «who pleads in the favor of the world». The narrative of *2 Enoch* has a similar pattern — the title of Governor in this context means «the Mediator of the Divine Judgment»[65] — Enoch pleads before the Lord for the world while reminding the world about the Divine Judgment.

Another interesting point about this material is the fact that the passage which is dedicated to the description of Enoch's role as «Governor of the World» is incorporated into a part of the book that is directly connected with other descriptions of the titles of Enoch. My previous observations about the celestial titles of Enoch showed that these descriptions are situated in chapters 21–38. These early chapters unfold Enoch's transformation from a human being into an angel in the highest celestial realms near the Throne of Glory.

In chapters 39–67, Enoch gives some instructions to his children during his brief visit to the earth. The text makes clear that during this visit Enoch is already an angelic being. In chapter 56 of *2 Enoch* he says to his son: «Listen, my child! Since the time when the Lord anointed me with the ointment of my glory, it has been horrible for me, and food is not agreeable to me, and I have no desire for earthly food».[66] This portrayal of Enoch as angelic being in this section of the book is very important, because it allows us to see traces of another tradition in the text of *2 Enoch*. It is possible that in this part of the book we have some remnants of developed Metatron tradition. Chapters 39–67 differ slightly from chapters 21–38 in the ways the picture Enoch's role in the celestial realm.

First, the later chapters (43–44) give an important description of Enoch as the Governor (Prince) of the world, a role which in late Merkabah literature usually is connected with Metatron tradition.

Second, an important aspect of the passage of chapters 43–44 is the Slavonic term п(р)ометаıа *(prometaya)*, which follows Enoch's title, «the Governor of the World».[67] This Slavonic term is found solely in the text of *2 Enoch*. There is no other Slavonic text where the word *prometaya* is documented. Phonetically close to the term «Metatron», *prometaya* could re-

---

all the children of men and their generation... And he wrote everything, and bore witness to the Watchers… And Enoch bore witness against all of them... And behold, he is there writing condemnation and judgement of the world, and all of the evils of the children of men». Wintermute, Jubilees… 62.

[65] See *Jub*. 4:24 «…he (Enoch) was put there for a sign and so that he might relate all of the deeds of the generations until the day of judgment». Wintermute, Jubilees… 63.

[66] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 183.

[67] «And behold my children, I am the Governor of the earth, [*prometaya*], I wrote them down…»

present a very early, rudimentary form of the name which later was transformed into the term «metatron».[68] It is noteworthy that we cannot find the term in the early chapters connected with the descriptions of other celestial titles.

Third, at the beginning of this textual block (chapter 40) we have the following words of Enoch: «Now therefore, my children, I know everything; some from the lips of the Lord, other my eyes have seen from the beginning to the end, and from the end to the recommencement».[69] This statement does not fit with previous descriptions of Enoch's initiations which were restricted by fixed temporal boundaries (angel Vereveil instructions for 30 days and 30 nights, and so on). Later, in ch. 50, Enoch says that the already «put into writing the achievements of every person, and no one can escape».[70] As we recall in his deeds as the Governor of the earth he already «arranged the whole year» and he «has distinguished every seed on the earth, and every measure and every righteous scale» (43:1). This unlimited horizon of functions and deeds of Enoch is not consistent with the previous narrative of chapters 21–38. It is apparent that we have two different traditions which sometimes demonstrate the lack of linkage and reconciliation.

Finally, we must keep in mind the fact which radically differentiates *2 Enoch's* story from other stories of early Enochic documents (like *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* or Enochic Qumran fragments). The important theological watershed of the Enochic and Metatron traditions in the book is the allegorical description of the extraction of Enoch from his «earthly clothing» and the placement of him into the «clothes of Glory».[71] In *2 Enoch* 22, after the archangel Michael extracted Enoch from his clothes and anointed him with the delightful oil which was «greater than the greatest light»,[72] Enoch becomes like «one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference».[73]

---

[68] I investigated the relationships between the words *prometaya* and Metatron in my article The Origin of the Name «Metatron» and the Text of 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // *JSP* 21 (2000) 19–26.

[69] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 165.

[70] Ibid. 177.

[71] A possible parallel to this theme could be *1 En.* 71 where Enoch «was born to righteousness». The text describes the situation when Enoch went through some sort of «transformation» when his whole body was «melted» and his spirit was transformed. Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 2. 166–167. However radical difference of this transformation from the similar event in *2 Enoch* is the fact that transformed Enoch in *1 Enoch* does not belong to the archangelic rank of «glorious ones» to which Metatron belongs. The text is silent about any sign of angelic transmutation.

[72] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 139.

[73] Ibid.

This symbolic event of angelic[74] transmutation[75] apparently represents in many ways an important turning point in which the Enochic tradition has moved into a new era of its development — the Metatron tradition.[76]

Conclusion

As I have already mentioned, the most impressive alignments between *2 Enoch* and Merkabah tradition are dependent upon developing the themes connected with the Celestial Titles of Enoch (Metatron). They give new evidence that the Metatron tradition has deep connections with early Enochic literature.[77]

As we know, the process of the hidden theological transformation, when one name («Enoch») suddenly becomes transformed into another name («Metatron»), does not demonstrate the continuity of the textual tradition. On the contrary, a gap exists between the early Enochic literature (*1 Enoch, Jubilees*, Enochic Qumran materials, *2 Enoch*) and the Metatron literature (the *Shi*ᶜ*ur Qomah* tradition, *3 Enoch*). Because of the two distinct names, it appears that the two traditions are not linked. Something seems to be missing between these two great theological streams. An important scholarly task will involve finding a «bridge» that may cross this theological gap between the prerabbinic Enoch and the rabbinic Metatron. One of the links may be found in the indissoluble continuity of the titles of this main character, which are common to both traditions. The titles, like the developed images of the heavenly roles of Enoch (Metatron), help us to see the transparent theological development which lies beneath the hidden meanings of these enigmatic names.

---

[74] J. H. Charlesworth rightly observes on this episode that «it is conceivable that here Enoch — although he is not explicitly called «an angel» — has attained the rank of an angel or been transformed into angel. The possibility looms large since in *2 Enoch* 21.3 Gabriel is identified as one of the Lord's glorious ones». J. H. Charlesworth, The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel // Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms / Ed. J. J. Collins, G. W. E. Nickelsburg (Chico, CA, 1980) (SCS, 12) 135–151 (147). Cf. also Scopello, The Apocalypse of Zostrianos… 377.

[75] In the Merkabah tradition we can find many parallels to this story. *3 Enoch* has the similar description of the clothing of Metatron in a garment of glory. «He made me a garment of glory on which were fixed all kinds of lights and He clad me in it». Odeberg, 3 Enoch… 2.32.

[76] P. Alexander notes that the transformation of Enoch in *2 Enoch* 22 provides the closest approximation, outside Merkabah literature, to Enoch's transformation into Metatron in *3 Enoch* 3–15. Alexander, 3 Enoch… 248.

[77] For a discussion of the date of *2 Enoch* in the first century CE before the destruction of the Second Temple, cf. Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism… 17; and Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism… 50.

ABSTRACT

The article explores the imagery of the celestial roles and titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*. The analysis of the celestial roles and titles shows that the transition from the figure of patriarch Enoch to the figure of angel Metatron occurred already in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch, a Jewish work traditionally dated to the first century CE.

Andrei A. Orlov
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

OVERSHADOWED BY ENOCH'S GREATNESS: «TWO TABLETS» TRADITIONS FROM THE *BOOK OF GIANTS* TO *PALAEA HISTORICA*

Introduction

In *Jewish Antiquities* Josephus unveils a certain tradition according to which the descendants of Seth …

> …discovered the science of the heavenly bodies and their orderly array. Moreover, to prevent their discoveries from being lost to mankind and perishing before they become known — Adam having predicted a destruction of the universe, at one time by a violent fire and at another by a mighty deluge of water — they erected two pillars, one of brick and the other of stone, and inscribed these discoveries on both; so that, if the pillar of brick disappeared in the deluge, that of stone would remain to teach men what was graven thereon and to inform them that they had also erected one of brick.[1]

In previous studies, several scholars have noted that although Josephus refers to Seth and his progeny, some features of the «two stelae» story allude to peculiar roles and situations which Jewish lore traditionally associates with the seventh antediluvian patriarch Enoch. One of these features includes the fact that Josephus credited Seth's descendants with the discovery of «the science of the heavenly bodies and their orderly array». Scholars have noted that this role from ancient time was traditionally ascribed to Enoch,[2] who in various Enochic traditions is portrayed as an expert in cosmological, astronomical and calendarical secrets.

Another important detail in Josephus' account is that the «two stelae» passage appears in *Jewish Antiquities* immediately before the story about the Giants. In 1:73 Josephus tells us that «many angels of God now consorted with women and beget sons who were overbearing and disdainful of every virtue,

[1] Josephus, Jewish Antiquities / Tr. H. S. J. Thackeray (Cambridge—London, 1967) (LCL) 4.33.

[2] J. VanderKam observes that in the passage about the discovery of astronomical learnings, Josephus «attributes the achievement not to Enoch but, instead, to the descendants of Seth». J. VanderKam, Enoch: A Man for All Generations (Columbia, 1995) 153. H. S. J. Thackeray also notes the «Enochic role» in Josephus' passage. See: Josephus, Jewish Antiquities… 4.32.

such confidence had they in their strength; in fact the deeds that tradition ascribes to them resemble the audacious exploits told by the Greeks of the giants».[3] J. VanderKam remarks that the author of *Jewish Antiquities* does not connect this «Enochic-sounding» tale with the seventh patriarch; «rather, he makes Noah preach to them — unsuccessfully».[4] He further suggests that «it is not impossible that Josephus took his information from a source such as *1 Enoch* 6–11, which mentions Noah but not Enoch».[5] It appears that the suggestions of scholars about the connection between the «two stelae» narrative and some Enochic materials are valid and deserve further investigation.

Besides Josephus' writings,[6] the two tablets/stelae tradition[7] appears in many other sources, including the Armenian *History of the Forefathers* and the Armenian *Abel*, the Latin *Life of Adam and Eve*, various Christian chronographers, a fragment from Greek *Palaea Historica*, and some other materials.[8] Even a brief review of these documents shows that the «two stelae» narrative contains traces of the Enochic traditions. The purpose of this chap-

[3] Josephus, Jewish Antiquities... 4.35.

[4] VanderKam, Enoch: A Man for All Generations… 153.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Another important early source about the antediluvian stelae is Jub. 8:1–3. On the tablets' tradition in the Book of Jubilees see: F. García Martínez, The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees // Studies in the Book of Jubilees / Eds. M. Albani et al. (Tübingen, 1997) (TSAJ, 65) 243–260. On the antediluvian writings see also: R. Eppel, Les tables de la loi et les tables célestes // *RHPhR* 17 (1937) 401–412; P. Grelot, La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification // *RSR* 46 (1958) 9–13; M. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism. 2 vols (Philadelphia, 1974) Vol. 1. 242–243; H. L. Jansen, Die Henochgestalt: Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung (Oslo, 1939) (Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1) 28ff; S. M. Paul, Heavenly Tablets and the Book of Life // *JANES* 5 (1973) 345–352; W. Speyer, Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike (Göttingen, 1970) 110–124.

[7] On the «two stelae» traditions see: W. Adler, Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus (Washington, 1989) (Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 26); D. Flusser, Palaea Historica — An Unknown Source of Biblical Legends // Studies in Aggadah and Folk-Literature / Eds. J. Heinemann, D. Noy (Jerusalem, 1971) (Scripta Hierosolymitana, 22) 51–52; S. D. Fraade, Enosh and His Generation (Atlanta, 1984) (SBLMS, 30) 19, 25–26; L. Ginzberg, Legends of the Jews. 7 vols (Philadelphia, 1955) Vol. 1. 120–122, Vol. 5. 148–150; A. F. J. Klijn, Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature (Leiden, 1977) (SNT, 46) 24–25, 121–123; S. Rappaport, Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus (Frankfurt a. M., 1930) 6–9, 87–90; M. E. Stone, Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve (Leiden, 1996) (SVTP, 14) 151, 198; idem, Selections from «On the Creation of the World» by Yovhannes Tulkuranci // Literature on Adam and Eve / Eds. G. Anderson et al. (Leiden, 2000) (SVTP, 15) 210.

[8] The Biblical concept of the two tablets, found in Ex 31–34, transcends the boundaries of the current research.

ter is to investigate these associations between the «two stelae» tradition and Enochic tradition.

I. «Shadows» of the Enochic Roles

Josephus' account of the two stelae specifically credited the architects of the antediluvian pillars (in Josephus' case, the Sethites[9]) with the discovery of the science of astronomy. It was noted earlier that this reference alludes to the seventh antediluvian patriarch, who, according to the *Astronomical Book*, first received such knowledge from the archangel Uriel during his celestial tour. A closer look at Josephus' passage and other textual evidence associated with the «two stelae» traditions shows that the discovery of astronomy is not the only Enochic achievement that appears to be borrowed in the variety of these stories. It seems that the employment of different Enochic roles is not a rare feature of these traditions. This section of our research will seek therefore to uncover the hidden «shadows» of the Enochic roles that were implicitly preserved in the various «two stelae» narratives.

Foreknowledge of the Destruction of the World

An account of the Byzantine chronographer John Malalas is one of the many witnesses to the two stelae traditions in medieval Christian chronicles. In the two tablets' story, in his *Chronography* 1:5, he seems to depend entirely on Josephus' evidence.[10] However, his retelling helps us to see some new angles in the familiar story. In his narration of Josephus' account, Malalas points to the foreknowledge of the future destruction of the world as an important characteristic of the authors of the antediluvian stelae.[11] He stresses

[9] On the figure of Seth and Sethian traditions see: T. Gluck, The Arabic Legend of Seth, the Father of Mankind (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1968); Klijn, Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature…; R. Kraft, Philo on Seth: Was Philo Aware of Traditions Which Exalted Seth and His Progeny? // The Rediscovery of Gnosticism. 2 vols / Ed. B. Layton (Leiden, 1981) (SHR, 41) Vol. 2. 457–458; G. MacRae, Seth in Gnostic Texts and Traditions // *SBLSP* 11 (1977) 24–43; B. Pearson, The Figure of Seth in Gnostic Literature // The Rediscovery of Gnosticism. 2 vols / Ed. B. Layton (Leiden, 1981) (SHR, 41) Vol. 2. 472–504; E. C. Quinn, The Quest of Seth for the Oil of Life (Chicago, 1962); M. Stone, Report on Seth traditions in the Armenian Adam Books // The Rediscovery of Gnosticism… Vol. 2. 459–471.

[10] E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys, R. Scott, The Chronicle of John Malalas (Melbourne, 1986) (Byzantina Australiensia, 4).

[11] Another Christian chronographer, George the Monk, also notices this feature: «...For the descendants of Seth had been warned in advance from on high about the coming destruction of mankind, and made two stelae, one of stone, the other of brick; and they wrote on them all the celestial knowledge set forth their father Seth, ...as Josephus says». Adler, Time Immemorial: Archaic History… 215. For the Greek text see: Georgii Monachi Chronicon. 2 vols / Ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1904) Vol. 1. 10.

that «Seth's descendants were god-fearing men and, having foreknowledge of the destruction, or change, that was then to affect mankind, made two tablets, the one of stone and the other of clay».[12] Again, this motif of the foreknowledge of the future destruction of the earth returns us to some situations and roles associated with Enoch.

In the Enochic traditions only a few prediluvian persons received revelation about the upcoming destruction of the world. Among them Enoch and Noah can be found. Although Noah is informed about the future destruction of the world, the specific function of writing down this revelation is usually assigned to Enoch, who in the *Book of the Watchers*,[13] *Jubilees*,[14] and in the *Book of Giants*,[15] is often portrayed as the one who writes and delivers the warnings about the future destruction to the Watchers/Giants and to humans. An important detail in these Enochic traditions relevant to the «two stelae» story (which entertains the idea about dual destruction of the world by water and fire), is the fact that, in contrast to Noah who is informed about the Flood, Enoch, due to the specifics of his mediating affairs, also knows about the upcoming destruction of the Watchers/Giants by fire.

Art of Writing

Josephus' passage pictures the descendants of Seth as the ones who inscribe astronomical discoveries on the pillars. It seems that the various «two stelae» stories seek to emphasize the scribal expertise of the Sethites by attributing to them even the invention of writing.

Although Josephus' fragment does not say directly that the descendants of Seth invented writing, other «two stelae» accounts often do so. Thus, the Armenian *Abel* depicts Enosh as the one who invented the letters.[16] The anon-

[12] Jeffreys, Jeffreys, Scott, The Chronicle of John Malalas… 4.

[13] See *1 Enoch* 12–14.

[14] See *Jub.* 4:23.

[15] See *4Q203 8*: «scri[be...] [...] Copy of the seco[n]d tablet of [the] le[tter...] by the hand of Enoch, the distinguished scribe [...] and holy (one), to Shemihazah and to all [his] com[panions...] You should know th[at] no[t...] and your deeds and those of your wives [...] they [and the]ir sons and the wives o[f their sons...] for [yo]ur prostitution in the [l]and. It will happen [t]o yo[u...] and lodges a complaint against you and against the deeds of your sons [...] the corruption with which you have corrupted it. [...] until the coming of Raphael. Behold, destruction [...] and which are in the deserts and whi[ch] are in the seas. And tear loose [the] totality [of...] upon you for evil. Now, then, unfasten your chains which ti[e (you)...] and pray. [...]». F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar (eds.), The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition. 2 vols (Leiden—New York—Köln, 1997) Vol. 1. 411.

[16] «However, we found that Enosh, son of Seth, made the letter(s) and called the planets by name. And he prophesied that this world would pass away twice, by water and by fire. And he made two stelae, of bronze and of clay, and he wrote upon them the names of the parts of creation which Adam had called. He said, "If it passes away

ymous chronicler included in the CSHB edition of John Malalas[17] and the Latin *Life of Adam and Eve* also point to the Sethites' invention of the art of writing by referring to Seth as to the one «who devised the caps of letters».[18]

Upon observing these references to the scribal activities of the various authors of the antediluvian stelae, one can easily recognize certain similarities to Enoch's figure. As was noted earlier, he, similar to the Sethites, was also involved in producing the antediluvian writings dedicated to the astronomical secrets.

The excursus about the unique scribal functions of the seventh antediluvian patriarch in the Enochic traditions can begin with the passage found in *2 Enoch* 22. It provides a striking picture of Enoch's initiation into the scribal activities which takes place near the Throne of Glory. During this initiation the Lord himself commands the archangel Vereveil to give a pen to Enoch so that he can write the mysteries explained to him by the angels. This tradition about the scribal functions of the patriarch is already documented in the earliest Enochic literature.[19] The *Book of Giants* fragments label Enoch as the distinguished scribe.[20] In *Jub.* 4:17, he is attested as the one who «learned (the art of) writing, instruction, and wisdom and who wrote down in a book the signs of the sky...».[21] In the Merkabah tradition, Enoch/Metatron is also depicted as a scribe who has a seat (later, a throne) in the heavenly realm.[22]

---

by water, then the bronze (will) remain, and if by fire, then the fired clay"». Stone, Armenian Apocrypha... 151.

[17] Ioannis Malalae Chronographia / Ed. L. Dindorf (Bonn, 1831) (CSHB) 5.

[18] A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve / Eds. G. Anderson, M. Stone (Atlanta, 1999[2]) (Early Judaism and Its Literature, 17) 96E.

[19] In *1 Enoch* 74:2, Enoch writes the instructions of the angel Uriel regarding the secrets of heavenly bodies and their movements. M. Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments. 2 vols (Oxford, 1978) Vol. 2. 173. Adler draws the reader's attention to an interesting passage from Michael Glycas which refers to Uriel's instruction to Seth in a manner similar to Uriel's revelation of the calendarical and astronomical secrets to Enoch in the *Astronomical Book* of *1 Enoch*. «It is said that the angel stationed among the stars, that is the divine Uriel, descended to Seth and then to Enoch and taught them the distinctions between hours, months, seasons, and years». Adler, Time Immemorial: Archaic History... 105. For the Greek text see: Michaelis Glycae Annales / Ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1836) (CSHB) 228.

[20] *4Q203 8*: «...Copy of the seco[n]d tablet of [the] le[tter...] by the hand of Enoch, the distinguished scribe...» García Martínez, Tigchelaar, The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition... Vol. 1. 411.

[21] J. C. VanderKam, The Book of Jubilees. 2 vols (Leuven, 1989) (CSCO, 510–511; Scriptores Aethiopici, 87–88) Vol. 2. 25–26.

[22] This tradition can be seen already in *2 Enoch* 23:4–6, which depicts the angel Vereveil commanding Enoch to sit down: «"You sit down; write everything..." And Enoch said, "And I sat down for a second period of 30 days and 30 nights, and I wrote accurately"». F. I. Andersen, 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 141.

The theme of Enoch/Metatron's scribal functions became a prominent motif in the later Rabbinic tradition, where according to *b.* Hag. 15a, the privilege of «sitting» beside God was accorded solely to Metatron by virtue of his character as a «scribe»; for he was granted permission as a scribe to sit and write down the merits of Israel.

Dissemination and Preservation of the Celestial Knowledge

Josephus' passage makes clear that the purpose of building the stelae was to preserve the astronomical knowledge for the postdiluvian generations. He writes that the Sethites wanted to build the pillars in order «to prevent their discoveries from being lost to mankind and perishing before they became known».[23] A similar motif can be found in Enochic traditions where Enoch's writings often serve for the same purpose of the preservation of knowledge in light of the impending flood. In *2 Enoch* 33 the Lord tells Enoch that the main function of his writings is the dissemination of knowledge and its preservation from the impending catastrophe:

> And give them the books in your handwriting, and they will read them and they will acknowledge me as the Creator of everything.... And let them distribute the books in your handwritings, children to children and family to family and kinfolk to kinfolk.... So I have commanded my angels, Ariukh and Pariukh, whom I have appointed to the earth as their guardians, and I commanded the seasons, so they might preserve them [books] so they might not perish in the future flood which I shall create in your generation.[24]

Despite the apparent «esoteric» character of the knowledge conveyed by the angels and the Lord to the seventh antediluvian patriarch, the dissemination of this information remains one of the major functions of Enoch-Metatron in various Enochic traditions. They depict him as the one who shares astronomical, meteorological, calendarical, and eschatological knowledge with his sons and others during his short visit to the earth. He also delivers knowledge about future destruction to the Watchers/Giants. In the Merkabah tradition, Enoch-Metatron is also responsible for transmitting the highest secrets to the Princes under him, as well as to humankind. H. Kvanvig observes that «in Jewish tradition Enoch is primarily portrayed as a primeval sage, [25] the ultimate revealer of divine secrets».[26]

---

[23] Josephus, Jewish Antiquities... 4.33.

[24] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 156.

[25] On Enoch's role as the knower of the secrets see: A. A. Orlov, Secrets of Creation in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* // *Henoch* 22 (2000) 45–62.

[26] H. S. Kvanvig, Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1988) (WMANT, 61) 27.

Expertise in Astronomical and Calendar Science

Josephus credited the authors of the antediluvian stelae with the discovery of astronomical and apparently calendarical knowledge, since his passage contains the reference to the science of the heavenly bodies and «their orderly array».[27] Another «two stelae» text, drawn from Michael Glycas, also refers to the Sethites discovery of the calendar. It reads that «the divine Uriel, descended to Seth and then to Enoch and taught them the distinction between hours, months, seasons and years…».[28] The «two stelae» traditions also claimed that the Sethites gave astronomical bodies their names. For example, the Armenian account of two stelae found in *Abel* explicitly supports this tradition by referring to Enosh, son of Seth, as the one who «called the planets by name».[29] This tradition, with a reference to Josephus, is repeated in the Chronicle of John Malalas.[30] The account about the naming of the planets also appears in the anonymous chronicler included in the CSHB edition of John Malalas.[31] In this text Seth is the one who called the planets by name. The account even refers to the specific Greek names, which Seth gave to the planets.

The depictions of the Sethites' achievements in astronomical science echoes traditional Enochic roles. Already in the early Enochic booklets of *1 Enoch*, Enoch is portrayed as the one who learned knowledge about the movements of the celestial bodies from the archangel Uriel. In the *Astronomical Book* the knowledge and revelation of cosmological and astronomical secrets become major functions of the elevated Enoch. The origin of these roles in Enochic traditions can be traced to *1 Enoch* 72:1, 74:2, and 80:1. In *1 Enoch* 41:1 Enoch is depicted as the one who «saw all secrets of heaven...» [32] *Jub.* 4:17 also attests to this peculiar role of the seventh patriarch. A large portion of *2 Enoch* is dedicated to Enoch's initiation into the treasures of meteorological, calendarical and astronomical lore during his celestial tour. Later Merkabah developments also emphasize the role of Enoch as the «Knower of Secrets». According to *3 Enoch* 11:2, Enoch-Metatron is able to behold «deep secrets and wonderful mysteries».[33]

---

[27] Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, 4.33.

[28] Adler, Time Immemorial: Archaic History… 105; Michaelis Glycae Annales… 228.

[29] Stone, Armenian Apocrypha… 151.

[30] «...the names which Seth, the son of Adam, and his children had given the stars, as the most learned Josephus has written in the second book of his *Archeology*». Jeffreys, Jeffreys, Scott, The Chronicle of John Malalas… 4.

[31] Ioannis Malalae Chronographia… 5–6.

[32] Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 2. 128.

[33] P. Alexander, 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 264.

Several scholars have noted the possible Enochic prototype behind the Sethites' role as the experts in astronomical and calendarical science. M. Stone, remarking on the passage from *Abel*, observes that «the tradition connecting Seth with the invention of the names of the stars is unusual. It may be related to the more prevalent tradition attributing the invention of both writings and astronomy to Enoch».[34]

In the distant past, R. H. Charles also noted that in the Byzantine chronicles many discoveries attributed to Seth reflect a transfer of «Enoch's greatness to Seth».[35] In reference to Charles' comments, W. Adler observes that the tradition attested in the «two stelae» narrative of Josephus and widespread in the Byzantine chronicles «became the basis for the attribution to Seth of numerous revelations and discoveries, many of them precisely parallel to those imputed to Enoch».[36]

Preaching to the Giants

It was observed earlier that in Josephus' account the «two stelae» story is attached to the Watchers/Giants narrative. The author of *Jewish Antiquities* portrays Noah's unsuccessful preaching to the Giants. J. VanderKam notes that «it is not impossible that Josephus took his information from a source such as *1 Enoch* 6–11, which mentions Noah but not Enoch, although in those chapters Noah does not try to improve the overbearing giants».[37] Indeed, despite the fact that some traditions point to a possible close relationship between Noah and the Giants in view of his miraculous birth,[38] his «experience» in dealing with the Giants in Enochic traditions cannot be even compared with Enoch's record. In various Enochic materials, Enoch is pictured as the special envoy of the Lord to the Watchers/Giants with a special, long-lasting mission to this rebellious group, both on earth and in other realms. The *Book of the Watchers* depicts him as the intercessor to the fallen angels. According to *Jub.* 4:22, Enoch «...testified to the Watchers who had sinned with the daughters of men... Enoch testified against all of them».[39] In the *Book of Giants* Enoch delivers the written «sermon», reprimanding the Watchers/Giants' sinful behavior and warning them about the upcoming punishment.[40] *2 Enoch* 18 portrays Enoch's «preaching» to the Watchers during his celestial tour, encouraging them to start the liturgy before the face of the Lord.[41]

---

[34] Stone, Armenian Apocrypha... 151.

[35] APOT. Vol. 2. 18.

[36] Adler, Time Immemorial: Archaic History... 105.

[37] VanderKam, Enoch: A Man for All Generation... 153.

[38] J. Reeves, Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants? // *JBL* 12 (1993) 110–115.

[39] VanderKam, The Book of Jubilees... Vol. 2. 27–28.

[40] See *4Q203 8*.

[41] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 130–133.

An examination of the surviving evidences to the «two stelae» story shows that some of them attest to a tradition different from that attested in Josephus. Instead of Noah's preaching to the Giants, they portray Enosh's preaching to the sons of God. Two references about the preaching to the sons of God in the «two stelae» traditions are especially important. Both of them have been preserved in the Armenian language and include the Armenian *History of the Forefathers* and *Abel*.

The Armenian *History of the Forefathers* 40–44 deals with the two stelae story. In 45 the narrative continues with the description of Enosh's preaching:

> 40 Sixth, because he [Enosh] set up two pillars against the sons of Cain, these are hope and good works, which they did not have.
> 41 Seventh, that he made writings and wrote on stela(e) of baked brick and bronze, and he prophesied that the earth will pass through water and fire on account of the sins of humans. And he cast the baked brick into the water and the bronze into the fire, in order to test (them), if the fire was to come first, the bronze would melt, and if the water was to come first, the brick would be destroyed. And by this means he learned that the water was destined to come, and then fire. And these are a work of hope.
> 42 And the writings on the two stelae told the names of all things, for he knew that by lispers, stutterers and stammerers the language was destined to be corrupted.
> 43 And they confused and changed the names of the objects that had come into being, which Adam had named and fixed. On this account he wrote (them) on the two stelae and left them, so that if the water came first and destroyed the pillar of baked brick, the bronze writing and names of things would remain, so that after the flood and the passing of times it might come to use.
> 44 Likewise, also if the fiery flood[42] and the bronze (i.e., stele) melted and ruined the writing, the earthen one might remain more baked. And this is a true action of hope.
> 45 Eighth, that Enosh preached to his sons to take on a celibate and immaculate way of life, for the sake of the just recompense of God. Two hundred persons, having learned this from him, remembered the life of paradise and established a covenant for themselves to live purely. And they were called «sons of God» on account of hope and of being busy with heavenly desire. For the glory of Christ, our hope.[43]

The Armenian *Abel* also portrays Enosh as the author of the stelae. However, in contrast to the previous text, it connects the tradition about the sons of God with Enoch and his antediluvian writings that survived the Flood:

---

[42] *b. Sanh.* 108b refers to a flood of water and a flood of fire. See Klijn, Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature… 122.

[43] Stone, Armenian Apocrypha… 198–200.

> 4.3 However, we found that Enosh, son of Seth, made the letter(s) and called the planets by name.
> 4.4 And he prophesied that this world would pass away twice, by water and by fire. And he made two stelae, of bronze and of clay, and he wrote upon them the names of the parts of creation which Adam had called. He said, «If it passes away by water, then the bronze (will) remain, and if by fire, then the fired clay».
> 4.5 And they were called true sons of God because God loved them, before they fornicated.
> 4.6 By this writing the vision of Enoch was preserved, he who was transferred to immortality. And after the Flood, Arpachshad made Chaldean writing from it, and from the others (were made).[44]

Several details in these two Armenian accounts about the preaching to the sons of God are important for establishing possible connections with Enochic traditions:

1. Both texts use the terminology of «sons of God»;

2. *History of the Forefathers* applies this term to the audience of Enosh's preaching;

3. *History of the Forefathers* also specifies the number of the sons of God as two hundred persons;

4. *Abel* 4.5 describes the sons of God as those whom God loved before they fornicated;

5. *History of the Forefathers* 45 refers to the possible angelic status of the sons of God, describing them as those who «remembered the life of paradise» and «being busy with the heavenly desire».[45]

An important characteristic in both texts is the reference to the «sons of God». Who are these sons of God? In the Bible the term can be traced to the Giants story in Gen 6. Scholars, however, note that in later Christian accounts the term «the sons of God» was often used in reference to the Sethites.[46] They also note the peculiar tendency to equate the Watchers and the Sethites in various accounts of the «two stelae» tradition.[47] It is quite possible that the authors of the two Armenian accounts understand the sons of God to be the Sethites. It is also evident that the prototype of the story was connected with the Watchers' story and Enoch's preaching to them. Several details in the texts point to this connection. First, *History of the Forefathers* 45 defines the number of «the sons of God» as two hundred. In the Enochic traditions this

[44] Stone, Armenian Apocrypha… 151–152.

[45] M. Stone observes that the Sethites are often called angels in some Greek patristic and Byzantine sources. Cf. Stone, Armenian Apocrypha… 150.

[46] Stone, Armenian Apocrypha… 150. Adler, Time Immemorial: Archaic History… 113–116. For a Christian interpretation of the «sons of God» see Fraade, Enosh and His Generation… 47–107.

[47] Cf. Adler, Time Immemorial: Archaic History… 92.

numeral appears often in reference to the number of the Watchers who descended on Mount Hermon.[48] Another important feature in the Armenian accounts is the description of the sons of God as those whom God loves before they fornicated. It may allude to the exalted status of the Watchers and their leaders before their descent on Mount Hermon.

The important aspect of the preaching story found in *History of the Forefathers* 45 involves the question why instead of Noah or Enoch this text depicts Enosh as the one who preaches to the sons of God. It is possible that Enoch's name here was misplaced with that of Enosh. M. Stone observes that Enosh and Enoch are often confused in the Armenian tradition.[49] It is noteworthy that the story about the sons of God found in *Abel* uses Enoch instead of Enosh. It might refer to the Enochic background of the Armenian accounts. The «two stelae» tradition from the Latin *Life of Adam and Eve* further supports our contention. Chapter 53 of the *Life* also has the passage about Enoch's «preaching» immediately after the «two stelae» account.[50]

II. Enochic Authorship of the Tablets

Palaea's Account

In *Palaea Historica*,[51] the Byzantine medieval compendium, the following passage, referring to Enoch's authorship of the two tablets can be found:

[48] Cf. *1 Enoch* 6:6: «And they were in all two hundred, and they came down on Ardis which is the summit of Mount Hermon». Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch... Vol. 2. 68.

[49] Stone, Armenian Apocrypha... 151.

[50] «On these stones was found what Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied before the flood about the coming of Christ: «Behold the Lord will come in his sanctuary (in his holy soldiers, in his soldiers, in his holy clouds?) to render judgment on all and to accuse the impious of all their works by which they have spoken concerning him — sinners, impious murmurers, and the irreligious who have lived according to their feelings of desire, and whose mouths have spoken pridefully». A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve... 96E. For the Latin text of *Vita,* see also: W. Meyer, Vita Adae et Evae // *Abhandlungen der königlichen Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosoph.-philologische Klasse* 14.3 (1878) 185–250; J. H. Mozley, The Vita Adae // *JTS* 30 (1929) 121–149.

[51] On *Palaea Historica* see: D. Flusser, Palaea Historica — An Unknown Source of Biblical Legends // Studies in Aggadah and Folk-Literature / Eds. J. Heinemann, D. Noy (Jerusalem, 1971) (Scripta Hierosolymitana, 22) 48–79; М. Н. Сперанский, Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей (Москва, 1960) 104–147; É. Turdeanu, Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament (Leiden, 1981) (SVT, 5) 392–403; О. В. Творогов, Палея Толковая // Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.) / Под. ред. Д. С. Лихачева. 2 тт. (Ленинград, 1987) Т. 2. 160–161; On various manuscripts of *Palaea Historica* cf. А. Васильев, Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina (Москва, 1893) L–LI.

> Concerning Enoch. Enoch was born and became a good and devout man, who fulfilled God's will and was not influenced by the counsels of the giants. For there were giants (on earth) at that time. And Enoch was translated (to heaven) by God's command, and no one saw [how] his removal [happened].
>
> Concerning Noah. In the days when the giants were around and did not want to glorify God, a man was born whose name was Noah, who was devout and feared God, and like Enoch he was not influenced by the giants' counsels....
>
> ...When the giants heard that the righteous Noah was building an ark for the Flood, they laughed at him. But Enoch, who was still around, was also telling the giants that the earth would either be destroyed by fire or by water. And the righteous Enoch was doing nothing else but sitting and writing on marble (tablets) and on bricks the mighty works of God which had happened from the beginning. For he used to say: «If the earth is destroyed by fire, the bricks will be preserved to be a reminder [for those who come after] of the mighty works of God which have happened from the beginning; and if the earth is destroyed by water, the marble tablets will be preserved». And Enoch used to warn the giants about many things, but they remained stubborn and impenitent, nor did they want to glorify the Creator, but instead each [of them] walked in his own will of the flesh...[52]

A glance at the *Palaea* fragment shows that it is completely different from the previous «two stelae» accounts based on Josephus' story. The main distinction is that Enoch, who in the Sethites' accounts occupied a peripheral role, stays now in the center of his own authentic narrative. The fact that the preaching to the Giants preceded the writing of the stelae emphasizes that the focus of the story was changed and the proper order of the events was restored.

This leads to important corrections. Unlike the Sethites in Josephus' account, Enoch does not try to preserve only one facet of the antediluvian knowledge, astronomical or calendar, but attempts to save the totality of the celestial knowledge, as it was commanded to him by the Lord in some Enochic accounts. Just as in *2 Enoch*, he writes about everything that happened before him.

In contrast to the Sethites' account, the *Palaea* does not mention the name of Adam. In the Sethites' «two stelae» stories, Adam serves as the mediator of the divine revelation, through whom the Sethites receive the knowledge about the future destruction of the earth. The *Palaea* does not refer to the Adamic tradition, since Enoch and Noah, unlike the Sethites, have direct revelation from God about the upcoming destruction.

These differences indicate that the author of the passage in *Palaea Historica* seems to draw on traditions different from those represented in Josephus.

[52] Васильев, Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina... 196–198.

It is also evident that the stories in *Palaea* and Josephus[53] rely on the common source in which Noah's figure was exalted.[54] In the Josephus account, however, the Noachic tradition[55] appears to be overwritten by the Adamic tradition.[56] In the Pseudepigrapha and the Qumran writings, the Adamic and Priestly-Noah tradition often compete with and suppress each other.[57] The «two stelae» story from *Jewish Antiquities* might contain the traces of such polemics.

Water and Fire

Among the several two stelae/tablets stories we have examined, the passage from *Palaea Historica* baffles the reader more than the rest. It portrays

[53] One will recall that the Josephus account has Noah, rather than Enoch, preach to the Giants.

[54] In *Palaea* the story of Noah looms large. The two tablets story is situated in the middle of a large Noachic account which occupies three chapters in *Palaea Historica*. Unfortunately, in our presentation of the *Palaea* fragment, we were unable to reproduce this lengthy Noachic narrative. For the full text of the Noachic account see Васильев, Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina… 196–200.

[55] On Noachic traditions see: M. Bernstein, Noah and the Flood at Qumran // The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues / Eds. D. W. Parry, E. Ulrich (Leiden, 1999) (STDJ, 30) 199–231; D. Dimant, Noah in Early Jewish Literature // Biblical Figures Outside the Bible / Eds. M. E. Stone, T. A. Bergren (Harrisburg, 1998) 123–150; F. García Martínez, Qumran and Apocalyptic (Leiden, 1992) (STDJ, 9) 24–44; F. García Martínez, Interpretation of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls // Interpretations of the Flood / Eds. F. García Martínez, G. P. Luttikhuizen (Leiden, 1998) (TBN, 1) 86–108; Kvanvig, Roots of Apocalyptic… 242–254; J. Lewis, A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature (Leiden, 1968); A. Orlov, «Noah's Younger Brother»: The Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch // *Henoch* 22 (2000) 207–221; J. Reeves, Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants? // *JBL* 12 (1993) 110–115; J. M. Scott, Geographic Aspects of Noachic Materials in the Scrolls of Qumran // The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After / Eds. S. E. Porter, C. A. Evans (Sheffield, 1997) (JSPS, 26) 368–381; R. C. Steiner, The Heading of the Book of the Words of Noah on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a «Lost» Work // *DSD* 2 (1995) 66–71; M. Stone, The Axis of History at Qumran // Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls / Eds. E. Chazon, M. E. Stone (Leiden, 1999) (STDJ, 31) 133–449; M. Stone, Noah, Books of // *EJ* 12 (1971) 1198; J. VanderKam, The Righteousness of Noah // Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms / Eds. J. J. Collins, G. W. E. Nickelsburg (Chico, 1980) (SBLSCS, 12) 13–32; J. VanderKam, The Birth of Noah // Intertestamental Essays in Honor of Jósef Tadeusz Milik / Ed. Z. J. Kapera (Krakow, 1992) (Qumranica Mogilanensia, 6) 213–231; Cana Werman, Qumran and the Book of Noah // Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha… 171–181.

[56] The influence of the Adamic tradition(s) can be found in the majority of the two stelae stories which are based on the Josephus account.

[57] See Stone, The Axis of History at Qumran… 133–149.

Enoch unceasingly writing on the tablets made from marble and brick. The depiction takes place in the midst of the Noachic narrative where the theme of the Flood comes to the fore. The reference to the tablets for the fire destruction therefore appears puzzling since the assurance of the approaching Flood makes them completely unnecessary. Why does Enoch need the tablets made from the two types of material if it is already certain that the earth will perish inevitably in the imminent Flood?

The answer to these questions can possibly be found by reference to the *Book of Giants,* where the theme of the Enochic tablets also looms large. Although the temporal locus of this narrative appears to be placed before the approaching Flood, it seems to entertain the idea of the dual destruction of the world, by water and by fire.

One of the Qumran Aramaic fragments of the *Book of Giants* (*4Q530*) depicts a dream in which a giant sees the destruction of a certain «garden» by water and fire.[58] Most scholars take this symbolic dream to signify the upcoming destruction of the world by water and fire. J. Reeves observes that «the Qumran passage reflects an eschatological conception[59] well attested in the Hellenistic era of a dual cosmic destruction, one of which employs water (*mabbul shel mayim*) and the other fire (*mabbul shel 'esh*)».[60]

In their analysis of the dream about the destruction of the garden, scholars have tried to establish a connection between the material from *4Q530* and the late Rabbinic text known as the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael.*[61] This rabbinic account was allegedly a part of the no longer extant *Midrash Abkir.*[62] Some scholars point to striking similarities between *Midrash of Shem-*

[58] *4Q530*: «...Then two of them dreamed dreams, and the sleep of their eyes and come to [...] their dreams. And he said in the assembly of [his frien]ds, the Nephilin, [...in] my dream; I have seen in this night [...] gardeners and they were watering [...] numerous roo[ts] issued from their trunk [...] I watched until tongues of fire from [...] all the water and the fire burned in all [...] Here is the end of the dream». García Martínez, Tigchelaar, The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition... Vol. 2. 1063.

[59] Some scholars point to a possible Mesopotamian background in this imagery of the dual destruction of the world. Cf. Klijn, Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature... 24, 123; J. Reeves, Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmology: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions (Cincinnati, 1992) (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College, 14) 145.

[60] Reeves, Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmology... 88.

[61] J. T. Milik, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4 (Oxford, 1976) 321–330; Reeves, Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmology... 86–87; L. Stuckenbruck, The Book of Giants from Qumran. Texts, Translation, and Commentary (Tübingen, 1997) (TSAJ, 63) 114–115.

[62] On Midrash Abkir see: H. L. Strack, G. Stemberger, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash (Edinburg, 1991) 341; A. Marmorstein, Midrash Abkir // *Debir* 1 (1923) 113–144.

hazai and Azael and the dream from *4Q530*.[63] Similarly to *4Q530*, the midrash also portrays the giant's dream about the destruction of the garden in a way that symbolizes the destruction of the world.[64]

The *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* has survived in several manuscripts,[65] including the composition known as the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel*. It is noteworthy that in the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* is situated between two almost identical stories connected with the «two stelae» tradition. In M. Gaster's edition[66] of the *Chronicles*, the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* occupies chapter 25. In chapter 24, the following story can be found:

> ... Jubal discovered the science of music, whence arose all the tunes for the above two instruments. This art is very great. And it came to pass, when he heard of the judgments which Adam prophesied concerning the two trials to come upon his descendants by the flood, the destruction and fire, he wrote down the science of music upon two pillars, one of white marble, and the other of brick, so that if one would melt and crumble away on account of the water, the other would be saved. 24:6–9.[67]

In chapter 26 of Gaster's edition, right after the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, the story about the two pillars is repeated again[68] in a slightly different form.[69] The second time, it is placed before the account about Enoch and the Flood.[70]

---

[63] For a detailed discussion of the similarities see: Reeves, Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmology... 86–87. For the criticism of Reeves' position see: Stuckenbruck, The Book of Giants from Qumran... 115.

[64] Milik, The Books of Enoch... 328.

[65] Cf. J. D. Eisenstein, Otzar midrashim. 2 vols. (New York, 1915) Vol. 2. 549–550; A. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrasch. 6 vols. (Jerusalem, 1967) Vol. 4. 127–128; Ch. Albeck, Midrash Bereshit Rabbati (Jerusalem, 1940) 29–31; R. Martini, Pugio Fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos (Lipsiae, 1687) 937–939.

[66] The Chronicles of Jerahmeel / Tr. M. Gaster (London, 1899) (Oriental Translation Fund, 4).

[67] Ibid. 51.

[68] M. Gaster in his commentary on both passages about the two tablets' tradition noted that «...in chapter 26 our compiler seems to have intercalated from the middle of paragraph 15 on to the end of 20 a tradition that occurs once before in chapter 24, paragraph 6–9, and which is missing in the Latin. It is not at all improbable that this portion belongs to the old original». The Chronicles of Jerahmeel... lxxv.

[69] «...Jubal heard the prophecy of Adam concerning two judgments about to come upon the world by means of the flood, the dispersion and fire, that he wrote down the science of music upon two pillars, one of fine white marble and the other of brick, so that in the event of the one melting and being destroyed by the waters, the other would be saved. 26:15–20». The Chronicles of Jerahmeel... 56.

[70] «...and Enoch — who was the author of many writings — walked with God, and was no more, for God had taken him away and placed him in the Garden of Eden,

An important detail in Jubal's fragments is that they do not connect the «two stelae» narrative with the Sethites, the constant feature of the stories based on the Josephus account.[71] Jubal represents the Cainites. Both texts from the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* do not seem to object to this line of descent. Jubal, as well as the Sethites, knows about Adam's prophecy. The reference to Adam in Jubal's story might indicate that the main theological concern of the writers/editors of the «two stelae» accounts was not the prominent role of the Sethites, but rather Adam's prophecy about the upcoming destruction of the earth. Here again the traces of the Adamic tradition(s) are clearly observable.

It was mentioned earlier that the *Book of Giants* entertains the idea of the dual destruction of the world, by water and fire. Although the Bible and the Pseudepigrapha commonly refer to the Flood they rarely use the image of the earth's destruction by fire. It also appears that the Enochic Watchers/Giants account is one of the few places in intertestamental Jewish literature where the necessity of such fire annihilation finds a consistent theological explanation. In spite of the fragmentary nature of the extant materials, they nevertheless are able to demonstrate the complexity of the theme in the *Book of Giants*.

It should be noted that the allusions to the future judgment by fire are not confined only to the Aramaic portions found at Qumran. The fragments of the *Book of Giants* which have survived in other languages give additional details of this theme in the book.[72] They include several Manichaean frag-

where he will remain until Elijah shall appear and restore the hearts of the fathers to the children. And the Flood took place». The Chronicles of Jerahmeel… 57.

[71] Another distinctive feature in Jubal's story is that it refers to white marble as one of the materials used for the stelae. As far as I know, the only other text that refers to this component in the «two stelae» stories is Enoch's account from *Palaea Historica*.

[72] Additional evidence that the motif of fire destruction played an important role in the *Book of Giants* is a passage from George Syncellus, which some scholars believe might be related to the textual tradition of the *Book of Giants*. See: Milik, The Books of Enoch… 318–320; Adler, Time Immemorial: Archaic History… 179. Syncellus' fragment describes the fire destruction of Mount Hermon, the prominent topos where the Watchers' descent once took place. The text preserved in Syncellus reads: «...and again, concerning the mountain, on which they swore and bound themselves by oath, the one to the other, not to withdraw from it for all eternity: There will be descend on it neither cold, nor snow, nor frost, nor dew, unless they descend on it in malediction, until the day of the Great Judgment. At that time it will be burned and brought low, it will be consumed and melted down, like wax by fire. Thus it will be burned as a result of all its works...». Milik, The Books of Enoch... 318. For the critical edition of the text see: Georgius Syncellus, *Ecloga Chronographica* / Ed. A. A. Mosshammer (Leipzig, 1984) (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana) 26–27. The story of fire destruction of Mount Hermon in Syncellus echoes *1 Enoch* 10:13–16, where God tells Michael that He has prepared the destruction by fire for the Watchers.

ments in Middle-Persian, Partian, and Coptic which address the motif the annihilation of the world by fire.[73]

Tablets

We mentioned earlier that there are some indications that the theme of the Enochic tablets play quite a prominent role in the *Book of Giants*. Unfortunately, the fragmentary character of the extant materials does not allow us to draw a coherent picture of the «tablets» tradition in this enigmatic text. It is important, however, to emphasize several features of this theme relevant to the subject of our investigation:

1. It is clear that the story of the tablets represents a major theme in the original *Book of Giants*. In a relatively small amount of the extant Qumran materials of the *Book of Giants*, the *contextual* reference to the tablet(s) occurs six times in three fragments: *2Q26*;[74] *4Q203* 7BII,[75] and *4Q203*

[73] The first group of fragments is connected with the final fire punishment of «sinners» (in Henning's opinion, «sinners» represent the Watchers and the Giants) under the eyes of the Righteous. Henning believes that this group of texts belonged to the Kawân. F — «(*Col. D*) ...sinners... is visible, where out of this fire your soul will be prepared (for the transfer) to eternal ruin (?). And as for you, sinful misbegotten sons of the Wrathful Self, cofounders of the true words of that Holy One, disturbers of the action of Good Deed, aggressors upon Piety, ...-ers of the Living..., who their...

(*Col. E*) ...and on brilliant wings they shall fly and soar further outside and above that Fire, and shall gaze into its depth and height. And those Righteous that will stand around it, outside and above, they themselves shall have power over that Great Fire, and over everything in it... blaze... souls that...

(*Col. F*)...they are purer and stronger [than the] Great Fire of Ruin that sets the worlds ablaze. They shall stand around it, outside and above, and splendor shall shine over them. Further outside and above it they shall fly (?) after those souls that may try to escape from the Fire. And that...» W. B. Henning, The Book of the Giants // *BSOAS* 11 (1943–1946) 68. Several other Manichaean fragments allude to the motif of the fire annihilation of the world. They include a Parthian fragment about the Great Fire and a Coptic fragment from Manichaean Psalm book where the name of Enoch is mentioned: N — «And the story about the Great Fire: like unto (the way in which) the Fire, with powerful wrath, swallows this world and enjoys it...»; Q — «The Righteous who were burnt in the fire, they endured. This multitude that were wiped out, four thousand... Enoch also, the Sage, the transgressors being...» Henning, The Book of the Giants… 72.

[74] *2Q26* «[...and] they washed the tablet to er[ase...] [...] and the water rose above the [tab]let [...] [...] and they lifted the tablet from the water, the tablet which [...] [...]...[...] to them all [...]». García Martínez, Tigchelaar, The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition… Vol. 1. 221.

[75] *4Q203* 7BII: «[...] [...] to you, Maha[wai...] the two tablets [...] and the second has not been read up till now [...]». García Martínez, Tigchelaar, The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition… Vol. 1. 411.

8.[76] The tablets are also mentioned in the Sundermann fragment of the Manichaean *Book of Giants*[77] and in the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*.[78]

2. Several fragments of the *Book of Giants* refer to *two* tablets. The two tablets are addressed in *4Q203* 7 BII and *4Q203* 8. This number of tablets also occurs in the Middle Persian fragment of the *Book of Giants* published by W. Sundermann.[79]

3. The extant materials ascribe the authorship of the tablets to Enoch. *4Q203* 8 refers to a «copy of the seco[n]d tablet of [the] le[tter...] by the hand of Enoch, the distinguished scribe...»[80] Enoch is described as the distinguished scribe. He is also portrayed as the one who copied the tablets, since the reference to a «copy of the seco[n]d tablet» in *4Q203* 8:3–4 occurs in conjunction with his name.

4. The reference to Enoch's copying of the tablet is quite intriguing, since «copying» plays a decisive role in the various two tablets/stelae materials mentioned in our research earlier, which are construed around the idea of the duplication of the tablets in various materials.

5. In conclusion to this section, it should be noted that the *Book of Giants'* materials seem to contain traces of a more developed and multifaceted tradition about the tablets than the later «two tablets» accounts. In the *Book of Giants* copying is only one of the several roles Enoch has in relation to the tablets. In this text the theme of tablets seems closely connected with other traditional roles of the elevated Enoch such as those of the Mediator[81] and the Witness of the Divine Judgment.[82] These Enochic roles are reflected in

---

[76] *4Q203 8*: «...Copy of the seco[n]d tablet of [the] le[tter...] by the hand of Enoch, the distinguished scribe [...] and holy (one), to Shemihazah and to all [his] com[panions...]...» García Martínez, Tigchelaar, The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition... Vol. 1. 411.

[77] W. Sundermann, Ein weiteres Fragment aus Manis Gigantenbuch // Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata (Leiden, 1984) (Acta Iranica, 23) 491–505.

[78] «One saw a great stone spread over the earth like a table, the whole of which was written over with lines (of writing). And an angel (was seen by him) descending from the firmament with a knife in his hand and he was erasing and obliterating all the lines, save one line with four words upon it». Milik, The Books of Enoch... 328.

[79] Sundermann, Ein weiteres Fragment aus Manis Gigantenbuch... 495–496.

[80] García Martínez, Tigchelaar, The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition... Vol. 1. 411.

[81] The «mediating» function of Enoch remains prominent during the whole history of the Enochic traditions. It has been shown previously that in *1 Enoch* and *2 Enoch,* the seventh antediluvian patriarch «transmits» celestial knowledge to various human and angelic agents. In the Merkabah tradition, Metatron/Enoch is also responsible for transmitting the highest secrets to the Princes under him and to humankind.

[82] On Enoch's roles see A. Orlov, Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch* // *JSP* 18 (1998) 71–86.

the peculiar functions of the tablets in the *Book of Giants*. The tablets serve as a record of accusations against the Watchers/Giants, representing the written account of their sins.[83] The tablets are also a mediating tool in the dialogue between God and the Watchers/Giants via the representatives of the both parties — Enoch and Mahaway.[84] These peculiar functions are only slightly hinted at in later tablet traditions.[85] The later «two tablets» traditions seem primarily preoccupied with the idea of copying, where the tablets are portrayed as the specific means for the preservation of knowledge in the impending catastrophe. They therefore appear to represent only one facet of the complicated story of the Enochic tablets.

Conclusion

1. The first part of our research deals with the «two stelae» stories based on the Josephus account. Our analysis of these accounts shows that they contain traces of the Enochic traditions. It appears that these «two stelae» stories interact with the Enochic traditions by way of attributing various Enochic roles to the alleged «authors» of the antediluvian stelae. These «authors» are usually portrayed as the Sethites. The attribution involves substantial rewriting of the original Enochic motifs and themes. The analysis also shows that the interaction of «two stelae» stories with Enochic traditions seems to involve some details of the Watchers/Giants' story.

2. The passage found in *Jewish Antiquities* and the stories which are based on this account demonstrate the influence of the Adamic tradition(s). In these accounts Adam's prophecy about the upcoming destruction of the earth serves as the reason for the making of the antediluvian stelae.

3. It is also possible that despite the decisive formative influence Josephus' account had on the subsequent «two stelae» stories, it itself represents the Adamic revision of the original two stelae/tablets account based on Noachic/Enochic traditions. Noah's preaching to the Giants in Josephus' account, the host of Enochic roles, and remnants of the Watchers/Giants story in various «two stelae» narratives may point to the Noachic/Enochic prototype.

4. It is possible that the Noachic/Enochic prototext was dedicated neither to the Sethites nor the Cananites who followed Adam's instructions, but rather to Enoch and Noah.

---

[83] Cf. *4Q203* 8:6–15 and possibly *2Q26*. Apparently the last one pictures an attempt to erase (wash out) this record of iniquities: *2Q26* «[...and] they washed the tablet to er[ase...] and the water rose above the [tab]let [...] and they lifted the tablet from the water, the tablet which [...] to them all [...]». García Martínez, Tigchelaar, The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition... Vol. 1. 221.

[84] García Martínez, Qumran and Apocalyptic... 110.

[85] *Palaea Historica* alludes to the fact that Enoch starts writing tablets only after the Giants rejected his call to repentance.

5. The tradition preserved in *Palaea Historica* might directly derive from this Noachic/Enochic original, which has not undergone Adamic revisions.

6. It is possible that some «two stelae» accounts might be connected with, or maybe even derived from, traditions similar to the *Book of Giants*. The circulating of materials related to the *Book of Giants* traditions in medieval Christian milieux does not seem impossible. W. Adler observes that some passages found in Syncellus «imply the existence of some work circulating in the name of the Giants».[86] He also demonstrates that such references sometimes occur in connection with the two stelae/tablets traditions.[87]

7. In an attempt to find possible antecedents for the two tablets story in the known Noachic/Enochic materials the tablet tradition(s) preserved in the *Book of Giants* fragments were explored.

8. While our comparative analysis of the «two stelae» traditions with materials from the *Book of Giants* revealed some suggestive similarities, it is evident that the extremely fragmentary character of the extant materials from the *Book of Giants* cannot give us definite evidence about the presence of the two stelae/tablets tradition in the original document.

ABSTRACT

The article investigates the «two stelae» tradition found in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* and other accounts. The analysis of these accounts shows that they contain traces of the Enochic traditions. It appears that these «two stelae» stories interact with the Enochic traditions by way of attributing various Enochic roles to the alleged «authors» of the antediluvian stelae. The attribution involves substantial rewriting of the original Enochic motifs and themes. The analysis also shows that the interaction of «two stelae» stories with Enochic traditions seems to involve some details of the Watchers/Giants' story.

[86] Adler, Time Immemorial: Archaic History… 91, n. 68.

[87] Cf. Ibid. n. 68 and 181–182.

Andrei A. Orlov
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

SECRETS OF CREATION IN *2 (SLAVONIC) ENOCH*

Enoch was found blameless, and he walked with the Lord and he was taken away, a sign of דעת for generations.
(Cairo Geniza Ms. B Sirach 44:16)

... the learned savant who guards the secrets of the great gods.
(Tablet from Nineveh, 19)

I. The Secrets

The notion of «secrets» occupies a distinct place in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*. The importance of this terminology is highlighted by its prominent position in the title of the book. While various manuscripts of *2 Enoch* are known under different titles, most of them[1] include the word «secrets».[2] In some of these titles the term is connected with Enoch's books — «The Secret Books of Enoch».[3] In other titles «secrets» are linked either to God («The Book[s] [called] the Secrets of God, a revelation to Enoch»)[4] or to Enoch himself

[1] Several MSS do not include the word «secrets» in their titles. Among them — *J* («The word of Enoch…»), *B* («The life of righteous Enoch…»), *MPr* («From the book of righteous Enoch»), P^2 («The book of Enoch the son of Ared»). Cf. М. И. Соколов, Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий, VII: Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного / Тексты, латинский пер. и исследование. Посмертный труд автора приготовил к изд. М. Сперанский // *ЧОИДР* 4 (1910) 2.47; 2.83; 2.106 and 1.145.

[2] **таинъı**. Cf. A. Vaillant, Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française (Paris, 1952) 2. Unless noted otherwise, this and the subsequent Slavonic citations are drawn from Vaillant's edition.

[3] Cf. MSS *A*: «From the secret book(s) about the taking away of Enoch the just», *Tr*.: «Which are called the secret books of Enoch», *U*: «From the secret books about the taking away of Enoch the just», and *Rum*.: «From the secret books of Enoch». Cf. F. Andersen, 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 103; Соколов, Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного… 1.161; 1.111; 1.153.

[4] MSS *V*, *N* «And these are the books (called) the secrets of God, a revelation to Enoch». Соколов, Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного… 1.83. Cf. also B^2 «This is the book of the secrets of God, a revelation to Enoch». Ibid. 1.133.

(«The Book of the Secrets of Enoch»).[5] This consistency in the use of the term «secrets», in spite of its varied attribution to different subjects, may indicate that the authors and/or the transmitters of the text viewed the motif of «secrets» as a central theme of the apocalypse. The purpose of this chapter is to call attention to some details of this theme in *2 Enoch*.

The Story

Despite the prominent role the word «secrets» seems to play in the titles of the book, it occurs, quite unexpectedly, only three times in the main body of *2 Enoch*, twice in chapter 24 and once in chapter 36. It is not, however, coincidental that the term is found in this section of the book. Chapters 24–36 of *2 Enoch* can be viewed as the climax of angelic and divine revelations to Enoch during his celestial tour. From these chapters we learn that Enoch, previously described to have been «placed» into the clothes of glory and instructed by the archangel Vereveil, was called by the Lord. The book tells that the Lord decided to reveal to Enoch the secrets of his creation, which he never explained even to his angels. Further the term «secrets» is applied only to this account of God's creation, conveyed to Enoch by the Lord himself, «face to face».[6] The content of these revelations includes the following details:

1. Prior to the creation the Lord decided to establish the foundation of all created things;
2. He commanded one of the invisible «things» to come out of the very lowest darkness and become visible;
3. By Lord's command a primordial «great aeon», bearing the name Adoil, descended and, disintegrating himself, revealed all creation which the Lord «had thought up to create»;[7]
4. The Lord created a throne for himself. He then ordered the light to become the foundation for the highest things;
5. The Lord called out the second aeon, bearing the name Arukhas, who became the foundation of the lowest things;
6. From the waters the Lord «hardened big stones», establishing the solid structure above the waters;
7. The Lord fashioned the heavens and the sun;
8. From fire the Lord created the armies of «the bodiless ones»;
9. The Lord created vegetation, fish, reptiles, birds, and animals;
10. The Lord created man.

[5] Cf. *P* «The book about the secrets of Enoch, the son of Ared», and *R* «The books of the holy secrets of Enoch…» Cf. Vaillant, Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch… 2; Соколов, Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного… 1.1.

[6] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 140.

[7] Ibid. 144.

While the general structure of the account of creation appears to be similar in the shorter and the longer recension, the latter offers a lengthy account dedicated to Adam's creation and his transgression.

Let it be also noted that the notion of «secrets» sets symbolic boundaries for the story of creation; it begins and closes the account of creation. In chapter 24 the Lord tells Enoch that he wants to instruct him in His secrets. In some manuscripts of the longer recension, chapter 24 even has a specific heading, «About the great secrets of God, which God revealed and related to Enoch; and he spoke with him face to face».[8] In chapter 36, which serves as a conclusion of the Lord's instruction, the Lord promises Enoch the role of the expert in His secrets — «Because a place has been prepared for you, and you will be in front of my face from now and forever. And you will be seeing *my secrets* (таинъı моѧ)...».[9]

Expert in Secrets

The tradition about Enoch as an expert in God's secrets does not begin in *2 Enoch*. Already in the earliest Enochic books of *1 (Ethiopic) Enoch*, the knowledge and the revelation of secrets become major functions of the elevated Enoch.[10] Later Enochic traditions also emphasize the role of Enoch as the «Knower of Secrets» (יודע רזים). According to *3 Enoch*, Enoch-Metatron is able to behold «deep secrets and wonderful mysteries».[11] In this Merkabah text Metatron is also responsible for transmitting the highest secrets to the Princes under him, as well as to humankind. H. Kvanvig observes that «in Jewish tradition Enoch is primarily portrayed as a primeval sage, the ultimate revealer of divine secrets».[12]

Two recent important studies[13] in Enochic traditions trace the origin of the image of Enoch as a primeval sage preoccupied with divine secrets to

[8] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 140.

[9] Ibid. 161.

[10] The origin of the role in Enochic traditions can be traced to *1 Enoch* 72:1, 74:2, and 80:1. In *1 Enoch* 41:1 Enoch is attested as the one who «saw all secrets of heaven...». M. Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch. 2 vols (Oxford, 1978) Vol. 2. 128.

[11] *3 Enoch* 11:2. Here and later I have used Philip Alexander's English translation of *3 Enoch*, and follow his division in chapters. Cf. P. Alexander, 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 264.

[12] H. S. Kvanvig, Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1988) (WMANT, 61) 27.

[13] J. VanderKam, Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition (Washington, 1984) (CBQMS, 16); Kvanvig, Roots of Apocalyptic... On Mesopotamian origins of Enoch's figure, see also: H. Zimmern, Urkönige und Uroffenbarung // E. Schrader, Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament. 2 vols (Berlin, 1902–1903) Vol. 2. 530–543; H. L. Jansen, Die Henochgestalt: Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung (Oslo, 1939) (Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos.

some heroes of the Mesopotamian lore. According to these studies, one of these possible prototypes can be an intriguing character of the «Sumerian» Kings list — Enmeduranki, king of Sippar. In three copies of the List he occupies the seventh place, which in Genesis' genealogy belongs to Enoch. In other Mesopotamian sources Enmeduranki appears in many roles and situations remarkably similar to Enoch's story. Among these roles are that of the knower and the guardian of the secrets of gods.[14]

The tablet from Nineveh, possibly dated before 1100 B.C.E., is a primary witness to the parallels between the stories of Enoch and Enmeduranki.[15] The text, reconstructed by W. G. Lambert,[16] describes Enmeduranki's initiation into the divine secrets and attests him as «the learned savant, who guards the secrets of the great gods». In this text[17] Enmeduranki also functions as a

Klasse, 1); P. Grelot, La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification // *RSR* 46 (1958) 5–26, 181–210.

[14] Grelot, La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible… 182, 186. Enmeduranki was also regarded as the founder of the *bārû* guild, the elite group of diviners, the experts in omens. Cf. VanderKam, Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition… 42.

[15] Kvanvig, Roots of Apocalyptic… 190.

[16] W. G. Lambert, Enmeduranki and Related Matters // *JCS* 21 (1967) 126–138.

[17] The text reads as follows:

3. «Šamaš in Ebabbara [appointed]
1. Enmeduranki [king of Sippar],
2. the beloved of Anu, Enlil [and Ea].
4. Šamaš and Adad [brought him in] to their assembly,
5. Šamaš and Adad [honored him],
6. Šamaš and Adad [set him] on a large throne of gold,
7. They showed him how to observe oil on water, a mystery of Anu, [Enlil and Ea],
8. They gave him the tablet of the gods, the liver, a secret of heaven and [underworld],
9. They put in his hand the cedar[-rod], beloved of the great gods.
10. Then he, in accordance with their [word(?)] brought
11. the men of Nippur, Sippar and Babylon into his presence,
12. and he honoured them. He set them on thrones before [him],
13. he showed them how to observe oil on water, a mystery of Anu, Enlil and Ea,
14. He gave them the tablet of the gods, the liver, a secret of heaven and under world,
15. He put in their hand the cedar[-rod], beloved of the great gods.
16. {The tablet of the gods, the liver, a mystery of heaven and underworld;
17. how to observe oil on water, a secret of Anu, Enlil and Ea;
18. 'that with commentary', When Anu, Enlil; and how to make mathemati cal calculations.}
19. The learned savant, who guards the secrets of the great gods,

mediator between the deities and the people of Nippur, Sippar and Babylon. He instructs them in the secrets, which he received from the deities.

Kvanvig observes that the tablet emphasizes the esoteric character of the divine wisdom revealed to Enmeduranki, reinforced by such terms as *niṣirtu* (mystery) and *pirištu* (secret).[18]

Another important detail in the passage is the juxtaposition of the terms «secrets» and «mysteries» with the phrases «heaven and underworld» and «heaven and earth». Kvanvig points out that both phrases have a «cosmological» meaning.[19] Intended to describe the totality of creation — «the whole world», this terminology can also be related to cosmogonic and creational concepts.

Secrets in Enochic traditions

Just as the role of Enoch as the Knower of secrets does not begin in *2 Enoch,* so also the information about the heavenly secrets is not peculiar only to this apocalypse. We encounter this theme in other biblical and the pseudepigraphical texts,[20] including the early Enochic booklets of *1 Ethiopic Enoch*.

20. will bind his son whom he loves with an oath
21. before Šamaš and Adad by tablet and stylus and
22. will instruct him. When a diviner,
23. an expert in oil, of abiding descent, offspring of Enmeduranki, king of Sippar,
24. who set up the pure bowl and held the cedar[-rod],
25. a benediction priest of the king, a long-haired priest of Šamaš
26. as fashioned by Ninhursagga,
27. begotten by a *nišakku*-priest of pure descent:
28. if he is without blemish in body and limbs
29. he may approach the presence of Šamaš and Adad where liver inspection and oracle (take place)».

Lambert, Enmeduranki and Related Matters... 132.

[18] Kvanvig, Roots of Apocalyptic… 188.

[19] Ibid. 188.

[20] On the notion of «secrets» in the Old Testament and the Pseudepigrapha see M. N. A. Bockmuehl, Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity (Tübingen, 1990) (WUNT, 2/136). Qumran texts also use extensively the notions of «secret» (רז) and «special knowledge» (דעת) and apply them to varied things, including the Torah and the halachic preceipts. Cf. Bockmuehl, Revelation and Mystery… 53–56; W. D. Davies, «Knowledge» in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 1.1:25–30 // W. D. Davies, Christian Origins and Judaism (Philadelphia, 1962) 119–144; B. Reicke, Da^{c}at and Gnosis in Intertestamental Literature // Neotestamentica et Semitica. Studies in Honor of Matthew Black / Eds. E. Earle Ellis, M. Wilcox (Edinburg, 1969) 245–255; H. Ringgren, Qumran and Gnosticism // Le Origini dello Gnosticismo / Ed. U. Bianchi (Leiden, 1967) (SHR, 12) 379–388.

1 Enoch applies the term «secrets» to various things Enoch acquires during his celestial tour. In 41:1–3 Enoch tells about his experience:

> ... I saw all the secrets of heaven, and how the kingdom is divided, and how the deeds of men are weighed in the balance. There I saw the dwelling of the chosen and the resting-places of the holy; and my eyes saw there all the sinners who deny the name of the Lord of Spirits being driven from there, and they dragged them off, and they were not able to remain because of the punishment which went out from the Lord of Spirits. And there my eyes saw the secrets of the flashes of lightning and the thunder, and the secrets of the winds, how they are distributed in order to blow over the earth, and the secrets of the clouds and of the dew...[21]

The passage shows that in *1 Enoch* the secrets include not only astronomical, cosmological, and calendarical information, but also eschatological details which Enoch acquired either himself or through angelic mediators.[22] The unity between the cosmological and the eschatological, between the secrets of «heaven» and the secrets of «earth», is prominent in *1 Enoch* 52:2, where Enoch attests that he «saw the secrets of heaven, everything that will occur on earth: a mountain of iron, and a mountain of copper, and a mountain of silver, and a mountain of gold, and a mountain of soft metal, and a mountain of lead ...all these things which serve the authority of the Messiah».[23] Markus Bockmuehl notes that cosmological and eschatological secrets occur repeatedly in tandem and show the intimate link between the cosmological mysteries of heaven and the eschatological questions pursued by the visionaries.[24]

The tendency to include the knowledge about future eschatological events in the notion of «secrets» can be found both in the Pseudepigrapha and in the Bible. Bockmuehl observes that the term רז in Daniel always relates in some way to a disclosure of the future.[25] The labeling of disclosures of the future as «secrets» becomes a prominent motif in the later «Enochic» text, *Sefer Hekhalot*. In *3 Enoch* 11:2–3 Enoch-Metatron tells R. Ishmael that from the time of his elevation he has acquired an ability to see deep secrets and wonderful mysteries.[26] According to the text, before a man thinks in secret, Metatron is able see his thought; before a man acts, he can see his act. Metatron

---

[21] Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 2. 128–129.

[22] For a complete discussion about «revealed things» in apocalyptic literature see M. Stone's pioneering research in M. Stone, Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature // Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God / Eds. F. M. Cross, W. E. Lemke, P. D. Miller, Jr. (New York, 1967) 414–452.

[23] Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 2. 136.

[24] Bockmuehl, Revelation and Mystery… 35.

[25] Ibid. 36.

[26] להסתכל ברזי עמוקה ובסוד מופלאה. P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H. G. von Mutius, Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur (Tübingen, 1981) (TSAJ, 2) 9.

concludes that «there is nothing in heaven above or deep within the earth concealed from me».[27] It is clear that the passage understands «secrets» to be foresights of human deeds and thoughts.

3 Enoch also demonstrates some other affinities with *1 Enoch* in its usage of the notion «secrets». First, it applies the word «secrets» to various revealed «things» — «all mysteries of wisdom, all the depths of the perfect Torah, and the thoughts of human hearts».[28] Second, in similarity with *1 Enoch,* it includes eschatological and historical details under the category of the «secrets». Third, the angels in *3 Enoch* are aware of God's secrets: «YHWH the God of Israel is my witness that when I revealed this secret to Moses, all the armies of the height, in every heaven, were angry with me...».[29] Fourth, Gruenwald's research emphasizes the close proximity between apocalyptic and Merkabah mysticism in the concept of «secret oath/name» which plays a significant role in the cosmology of *1 Enoch* and *3 Enoch*.[30]

In contrast to these apocalyptic and Merkabah Enochic texts, *2 Enoch* offers a different understanding of «secrets». At least four points of difference need to be noted. First, *2 Enoch* does not apply the notion of «secrets» to many types of revelation. This term occurs very rarely in the book and is reserved only for the particular cosmogonic[31] revelation of the Lord. Second, the term is never applied to an earthly affair, not even in reference to historical and eschatological information. Third, the «secret name» does not play any significant role in *2 Enoch's* cosmogony. Fourth, the angels in *2 Enoch* do not know about God's cosmogonic «secrets».

Moreover, it seems that in *2 Enoch* the realm of the secrets, even «topologically», transcends the angelic world. The shorter recension tells us that before the cosmogonic revelation took place, the Lord had «placed» Enoch to the left of Himself, closer than Gabriel.[32] Further, the Lord confirms the transcendence of the knowledge about creation over the angelic world when He informs Enoch that even to his angels He has explained neither his secrets nor his «endless and inconceivable creation which He conceived».[33]

---

[27] Alexander, 3 Enoch... 264.

[28] *3 Enoch* 11:1. Cf. Alexander, 3 Enoch... 264.

[29] Ibid. 315.

[30] I. Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism (Leiden, 1980) (AGJU, 14) 10–11.

[31] On cosmogony in *2 Enoch*, see S. Pines, Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch // Types of Redemption / Ed. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, J. Jouco Bleeker (Leiden, 1970) (SHR, 18) 72–87; M. Philonenko, La cosmogonie du «Livre des secrets d'Hénoch» // Religions en Égypte: Hellénistique et romaine (Paris, 1969) 109–116; G. Scholem, On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead (New York, 1991) 98–101; idem, Origins of the Kabbalah (Princeton, 1987).

[32] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 143.

[33] Ibid. 143.

The «secrecy» of the Lord's revelation is underscored further by several additional factors.

First, immediately following the cosmogonic instructions, the Lord informed Enoch that he appointed an intercessor, the archangel Michael, and guardian angels, Arioch and Marioch,[34] for Enoch's writings which should not perish in the impending flood:

> For I will give you an intercessor, Enoch, my archistratig, Michael, on account of your handwritings and the handwritings of your fathers — Adam and Seth. They will not be destroyed until the final age. For I have commanded my angels Arioch and Marioch, whom I have appointed on the earth to guard them and to command the things of time to preserve the handwritings of your fathers so that they might not perish in the impending flood which I will create in your generation (33:10–12).[35]

The motif of the guardian angels of the books is peculiar to the esoteric tradition conveyed to Enoch. It might indicate that we are dealing here with the famous «secret» books by which antediluvian wisdom reached postdeluvian generations. This motif of antediluvian «secret» writings has a number of parallels in Mesopotamian lore.[36]

Second, the esoteric details of the Lord's cosmogonic revelations do not appear in chapters 39–66, dedicated to Enoch's instructions to his children. In these chapters Enoch shares the information about his heavenly tour and his extraordinary experiences near the Throne of Glory. He conveys to his children an esoteric knowledge which includes meteorological, cosmological, and eschatological information. In this section of the book Enoch even offers a lengthy description of the Lord's limbs «without measure and analogy»[37] which, some scholars believe, belongs to another highly esoteric trend of Jewish mysticism.[38] The full account of God's cosmogonic revelations, however, does not appear in these instructions of Enoch. Even though the text makes several allusions to the creation story, telling us that «the Lord was the one who laid the foundations upon the unknown things and ... spread out the heavens above the visible and the invisible things»,[39] Enoch never discloses to his children the full story about Adoil and Arukhas.

---

[34] On the origin of the names Arioch and Marioch see J. Fossum, The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord (Tübingen, 1985) (WUNT, 36) 321–328; L. Gry, Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Hénoch // *RB* 49 (1940) 199–200.

[35] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 157.

[36] Cf. Grelot, La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible... 9–13.

[37] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 163.

[38] G. Scholem argues that the terminology of this section in *2 Enoch* shows apparent similarities to the שיעור קומה tradition. Cf. Scholem, On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead... 29.

[39] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 174.

II. Secrets of Creation in the Merkabah Tradition

Despite the differences in the treatment of «secrets» in *2 Enoch* and *3 Enoch* that have been mentioned earlier, the approach to the mysteries of creation found in *3 Enoch* demonstrates close affinities with that in the *Slavonic Enoch*.

The theme of the secrets of creation plays an important role in *3 Enoch*; it is surrounded by several details found in *2 Enoch*. The similarities include the following points:

1. One of these parallels is Enoch's initiation into the secrets of Creation. The important detail in both texts is that some preparatory instructions before the account of creation were given through angels. In the case of *3 Enoch*, the instructions were given through the angels known as the «Prince of Wisdom» (שר החכמה) and the «Prince of Understanding» (שר הבינה); in the case of *2 Enoch* they came through the angel Vereveil (Вερεвеил). In both books these angelic mediators do not reveal «secrets» but offer instead some preparatory knowledge. In *2 Enoch* Vereveil instructs Enoch in different «things» — «all things of heaven and earth and sea and all the elements and the movements and their courses ... and the Hebrew language, every kind of language of the new song of the armed troops and everything that it is appropriate to learn» (23:1–2).[40] In *3 Enoch* the Prince of Wisdom and the Prince of Understanding teach Enoch-Metatron «wisdom» — «the wisdom of those above and those below, the wisdom of this world and the world to come».[41]

2. Both texts also mention that immediately after these preparatory angelic instructions, the Lord (the Holy One) reveals «the secrets of creation» to Enoch (Metatron). From *3 Enoch* 11:2 we learn that all the secrets of creation (סתרי בראשית)[42] now stand revealed before Enoch-Metatron as they stand revealed before the Creator. In *2 Enoch* 24:2–4 the Lord instructs Enoch in the secrets of his «endless and inconceivable creation», the mysteries which he never explained even to his angels:

> Whatever you see, Enoch, things standing still and moving about and which were brought to perfection by me, I myself will explain it to you.... And not even to my angels have I explained my secrets, nor related to them their composition, nor my endless and inconceivable creation which I conceived, as I am making them known to you today.[43]

3. As was mentioned earlier, the notion of «secrets» in *3 Enoch* includes various types of revelations. Even though the book applies the term «secrets»

[40] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 140.

[41] Alexander, 3 Enoch... 264.

[42] MS M40. Cf. Schäfer, Synopse... 8. MS V228 instead of «the secrets of creation» uses — «the orders of creation» (סדרי בראשית). Cf. Schäfer, Synopse... 9.

[43] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 143.

to several things, including the Torah, it also seems to use the notion of «the special secret» in reference to certain details of the Account of Creation. According to the book, this special secret plays an important role in «God's creation of everything». We learn about the secret from *3 Enoch* 48D, where Metatron tells R. Ishmael that he was the person who revealed the special secret Moses, in spite of the protests of the heavenly hosts:

> YHWH the God of Israel is my witness that when I revealed this secret to Moses, all the armies of the height, in every heaven, were angry with me. They said to me, «Why are you revealing this secret to humankind, born of woman, blemished, unclean, defiled by blood and impure flux, men who excrete putrid drops — that secret by which heaven and earth were created, the sea and the dry land, mountains and hills, rivers and springs, Gehinnom, fire and hail, the garden of Eden and the tree of life? By it Adam was formed, the cattle and the beasts of the field, the birds of heaven and the fish of the sea, Behemoth and Leviathan, the unclean creatures and reptiles, the creeping things of the sea and the reptiles of the deserts, Torah, wisdom, knowledge, thought, the understanding of things above, and the fear of heaven. Why are you revealing it to flesh and blood?»[44]

P. Alexander observes that in this passage «the secret» could be either (1) the Torah, or (2) the secret names of God. He further suggests that «the identification of the secret with the Torah appears to be excluded by the fact that Torah is one of the things created by the secret».[45] This situation in which the notion of «secret» transcends the realm of the Torah and refers instead to God's creation appears to have close affinities to the position of *2 Enoch*, where the Torah is not listed among God's mysteries.

III. Secrets of Creation in the Zoharic Tradition

The cosmogonic account in *2 Enoch* demonstrates close similarities not only with that in the Merkabah tradition[46] but also with much later developments of Jewish mysticism. The following analysis is an attempt to trace some affinities between the account of creation in *2 Enoch* and that in some medieval texts of Jewish mysticism.

Stones

In one of his books[47] G. Scholem points to an interesting detail in the creation narrative in *2 Enoch*. The story involves the enigmatic stones the

[44] Alexander, 3 Enoch… 315.

[45] Ibid. 315.

[46] On the Merkabah features of *2 Enoch* cf. A. Orlov, Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch* // *JSP* 18 (1998) 71–86; idem, The Origin of the Name Metatron and the Text of *2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch* // *JSP* 21 (2000) 19–26.

[47] Scholem, Origins of the Kabbalah… 73.

Lord placed in the waters during the process of creation. In chapters 28–29, when the Lord instructed Enoch about the secrets of the Account of Creation, He said:

> Then from the waters I hardened[48] big stones,[49] and the clouds of the depths[50] I commanded to dry themselves. And I did not name what fell to the lowest places.[51] Gathering the ocean into one place, I bound it with a yoke. I gave to the sea an eternal boundary, which will not be broken through by the waters. The solid structure[52] I fixed and established it above the waters (28:2–4).[53]

The theme of the «big stones» plays an important role in the creation narrative of *2 Enoch*. G. Scholem draws attention to the relationship between these enigmatic stones and the cosmogonic tradition of «an esoteric baraitha[54] in which the word בהו in תהו ובהו of Genesis 1:2 was interpreted as muddy stones, sunk in the abyss».[55] Scholem's remark[56] invites a further exploration into the role of the enigmatic stones in Aggadic traditions. *m.* Hag. 2:1 prohibits the exposition of מעשה בראשית in the public. Cosmogonic doctrines, however, were important during all stages of Jewish mysticism,[57] and occupied a prominent place in such books as *Sefer Yetsirah* and *Sefer ha-Bahir*.[58] Isaiah Tishby observes that the understanding of the causes and proc-

[48] The verb **оутвѣрдити** could be also rendered as «to place». Sreznevskij's dictionary lists this translation among possible meanings of the Slavonic word. See И. Срезневский, Словарь древнерусского языка. 3 тома (Москва, 1989) Т. 3. 1306.

[49] **камение велико**.

[50] **бездънымъ**. Another choice for translation can be «*abyss*». Kurz and Sreznevskij equate the Slavonic term with the Greek ἄβυσσος. Cf. J. Kurz (ed.), Slovník Jazyka Staroslovenského [Lexicon Linguae Palaeo-Slovenicae]. 4 vols. (Prague, 1966) Vol. 1. 76; Срезневский, Словарь древнерусского языка… Т. 1. 55.

[51] **бездны**. Again the same term, which can be translated as «*abyss*».

[52] **Твердь**. This Slavonic word can be also translated as «a foundation». The verb **wснова**χ («established») favors such a translation.

[53] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 147.

[54] *b*. Hag. 12a.

[55] Scholem, Origins of the Kabbalah… 74. He points also to «the muddy stones from which darkness flows» in the Targum on Job 28:8. Another interesting early parallel could be «stones of bohu» in Isa 34:11.

[56] Gershom Scholem was a unique exception in his field, as he persistently tried to investigate the relationships between *2 Enoch* and the Jewish mystical traditions. Even though his observations on possible parallels between *2 Enoch* and Jewish texts are not systematic, they are very perceptive and can provide many insights for students of *2 Enoch*.

[57] Cf. G. Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (New York, 1954).

[58] For the discussion of the parallels between the cosmogonies of these two texts and *2 Enoch* cf. Scholem, Origins of the Kabbalah… 73–75; idem, On Mystical Shape of the Godhead… 98–100.

esses of the formation of the world became one of the central themes in late Jewish mysticism.[59]

In late Jewish mysticism, especially in the *Zohar*, the theme of the big stones placed by the Creator in the waters (in the abyss) occupied an important place. In spite of the late date of the *Zohar*, these materials have preserved important early traditions relevant to the subject of our research. Moreover, this medieval compendium of Jewish mystical knowledge mentions a book under the title «The Book of the Secrets of Enoch»[60] which is identical with the titles given to *2 Enoch* in some manuscripts.[61]

Similarities between *2 Enoch* and the *Zohar* are not confined only to the title of the *Slavonic Enoch*. Several scholars, including G. H. Box and H. Odeberg, have noted striking parallels between both texts, especially in the materials of the longer recension. G. H. Box points to the connection between *2 Enoch* and the *Zohar* and observes that «the *Slavonic Enoch*... is remarkably illuminating in its realistic presentment of some of the Kabbalistic ideas — e.g. as to the process of creation, the constitution of the heavens, and so on».[62] H. Odeberg, who was Box's student at the University of London, holds a similar view.[63] In spite of some apparent deficiencies in his edition[64] of *3 Enoch* his work contains important insights into possible relationships between the *Slavonic Enoch* and late Jewish mysticism. Odeberg, who used Forbes' separate translations of the shorter and longer recensions of *2 Enoch,* makes a number of provocative comments on the nature of the Jewish mystical traditions incorporated in these texts. In his opinion, the longer recension sometimes contains concepts that belong to a later (post-Hekhaloth) development of Jewish mysticism. In this respect, he found a number of striking similarities with the Zoharic tradition. It should be noted that Odeberg's position was partially conditioned by his favoring of the shorter recension as more ancient and original.[65] He viewed the longer recension as a later

[59] I. Tishby, The Wisdom of the Zohar: Anthology of Texts. 3 vols. (London, 1994) Vol. 2. 549.

[60] ובספרא דרזין דחנוך. 2.180b. Cf. R. Margaliot (ed.), ספר הזהר. 3 vols. (Jerusalem, 1940) Vol. 2. 360.

[61] Cf. *P* **книга ѡ таинахъ ѳноховихъ** («The book about the secrets of Enoch») and *R* **книги сватиχ таинь ѳноχов** («The books of the holy secrets of Enoch»). Cf. Vaillant, Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch… 1; Соколов, Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного… 1.1.

[62] W. O. E. Oesterley, G. H. Box, A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinical and Mediaeval Judaism (New York, 1920) 236.

[63] Cf. H. Odeberg, 3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch (New York, 1973) 1.22.

[64] Cf. J. Greenfield, Prolegomenon // Odeberg, 3 Enoch… xi–xlvii.

[65] Although, «original» might be an inappropriate word here. P. Sacchi rightly observes that «the original is an abstract concept; no one possesses the author's manu-

expansion of the shorter one. In the light of the recent studies of F. Andersen, J. Charlesworth,[66] A. de Santos Otero,[67] and C. Böttrich,[68] who argue for the originality of the longer recension, Odeberg's hypothesis is losing its persuasive power. In this context an investigation of the possible parallels between the story of creation in *2 Enoch* and the Account of Creation in the *Zohar* can contribute not only to our understanding of the hypothetical provenance of the longer recension but to the provenance of the text in general. It also can clarify the formative value of the account of creation in *2 Enoch* for subsequent rabbinic developments. The importance of such inquiry constitutes one of the reasons for the inclusion of some materials from the *Book of Zohar* in our research.

Zohar I, 231a reads:

> The world did not come into being until God took a certain stone, which is called the «foundation stone»,[69] and cast it into the abyss[70] so that it held fast there, and from it the world was planted. This is the central point of the universe, and on this point stands the holy of holies. This is the stone referred to in the verses, «Who laid the corner-stone thereof» (Job XXXVIII, 6), «the stone of testing, the precious corner-stone» (Is. XXVIII, 16), and «the stone that the builders despise became the head of the corner» (Ps. CXVIII, 22). This stone is compounded of fire, water, and air, and rests on the abyss. Sometimes water flows from it and fills the deep. This stone is set as a sign in the centre of the world.[71]

Zohar II, 222a continues the theme of the foundation stone:

> When the Holy One, blessed be He, was about to create the world, He detached one precious stone[72] from underneath His Throne of Glory and

script. Even the original of the *Book of the Secrets of Enoch* is only the most ancient form of the text available, and therefore the closest to the Original (with a capital 'O')». Cf. P. Sacchi, Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History (Sheffield, 1990) (JSPSS, 20) 237.

[66] Cf. J. H. Charlesworth, The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch (Seminar Report) // *NTS* 25 (1979) 315–323; idem, The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament. Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins (Cambridge, 1985) (SNTSMS, 54) 102–106.

[67] A. de Santos Otero, Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo) // Apocrifos del AT / Ed. A. Díes Macho. 4 vols. (Madrid, 1984) Vol. 4. 147–202.

[68] C. Böttrich, Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch (Tübingen, 1992) (WUNT, 2/50); idem, Das slavische Henochbuch (Gütersloh, 1995) (JSHRZ, 5); idem, Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch (Frankfurt am Main, 1995) (Judentum und Umwelt, 59).

[69] אבן שתיה. Margaliot, ספר הזהר... Vol. 1. 461.

[70] תהומא. Ibid. 461.

[71] H. Sperling, M. Simon (trs.), The Zohar. 5 vols (London—New York, 1933) Vol. 2. 399.

[72] אבנא יקירא. Margaliot, ספר הזהר... Vol. 2. 443.

> plunged it into the Abyss, one end of it remaining fastened therein whilst the other end stood out above; and this other and superior head constituted the nucleus of the world, the point out of which the world started, spreading itself to right and left and into all directions, and by which it is sustained. That nucleus, that stone, is called *shethyiah* (foundation), as it was the starting-point of the world. The name *shethyiah*, furthermore, is a compound of *shath* (founded) and *Yah* (God), signifying that the Holy One, blessed be He, made it the foundation and starting-point of the world and all that is therein.[73]

We will now examine some important similarities between *2 Enoch* and these Zoharic passages. The text of *2 Enoch* uses the term **бєздна**[74] (literally, «abyss») which also occupied a prominent place in the narrative of the *Zohar*. In the *Zohar*, the Holy One cast a stone into the abyss. *2 Enoch* does not mention that the stone fell into the abyss but does utilize the phrase, «I did not name what fell to the abyss» (28:3), with the implication that this act of the Lord had already taken place.

Another important motif in relation to the stones in both texts has to do with the theme of «establishing the foundation». *2 Enoch* tells that the stones (stone) are related to the foundation which the Lord has established above the waters.[75] This labeling of stones as «foundation» is very typical for the Zoharic narrative, where the stone is referred to many times as שתיה («foundation») or אבן שתיה («foundation stone»). The concept of the «Foundation Stone» occupies a prominent place in several cosmological stories.[76] E. Burrows' research points to the Mesopotamian provenance of the concept of the «Foundation Stone», which symbolizes in these traditions the bond between heaven and earth.[77] Burrows traces the geographical origins of this cosmogonic pattern to «the sanctuaries at Nippur, at Larsa, and probably at Sippar».[78] The possible connection with Sippar is especially important for the Enochic text, if we keep in mind the possible Mesopotamian origin of Enoch's figure, based on the antediluvian king Enmeduranki of Sippar.

Finally, the difference in the number of stones in both texts must also be explained. The *Zohar* tells about one foundation stone, *2 Enoch* speaks about

---

[73] Sperling, Simon, The Zohar… Vol. 4. 258–259.

[74] **мглам же бєздньімъ** — the clouds of the abyss, or the darkness of the abyss; **оупадъкъ бєздны** — what fell to the abyss.

[75] **Твердь водроужихъ и шєновахъ врѣхоу вод** (literally — «I erected a firm foundation and established it above the waters»).

[76] On the concept of the Foundation Stone, see L. Ginzberg, Legends of the Jews. 7 vols. (Philadelphia, 1955) Vol. 5. 15; E. Burrows, Some Cosmological Patterns in Babylonian Religion // The Labyrinth / Ed. S. H. Hooke (London, 1935) 45–59; Fossum, The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord… 250ff.

[77] Burrows, Some Cosmological Patterns… 45–59.

[78] Ibid. 46–47.

stones.[79] But later in the narrative of *2 Enoch*, the term switches from the plural to the singular, and refers only to one stone: «From the stone I cut off a great fire... (29:3)».[80]

Adoil and Arukhaz: Etymology of the Names

During His instructions in the secrets of creation, the Lord told Enoch that in the beginning of creation he had thought to create a visible creation from the invisible. This process occupies an important place in the narrative of *2 Enoch* and demonstrates in complicated imagery this stage of creation. To assist our inquiry, the following passage must be quoted:

> The Lord told Enoch: And I thought up the idea of establishing a foundation, to create a visible creation. And I commanded the lowest things: «Let one of the invisible things come out visibly!» And Adoil[81] descended, extremely large. And I looked at him, and, behold, in his belly he had a great age.[82] And I said to him, «Disintegrate yourself, Adoil, and let what is disintegrated from you become visible». And he disintegrated himself, and there came out from him the great age. And thus it carried all the creation which I had wished to create. And I saw how good it was. And I placed for myself a throne, and I sat down on it. To the light I spoke: «You go up higher and be solidified and become the foundation for the highest things». And there is nothing higher than the light, except nothing itself. And I spoke, I straightened myself upward from my throne. And I called out a second time into the lowest things, and I said, «Let one of the invisible things come out solid and visible». There came out Arukhas,[83] solid and heavy and very black. And I saw how suitable he was. And I said to him, «Come down low and become solid! And become the foundation of the lowest things!» And there is nothing lower than the darkness, except nothing itself (24–26).[84]

The passage deals with two enigmatic names, Adoil and Arukhas. Much attention has been devoted to the etymology of these words which might indicate that many scholars consider these names as important cues for clarifying the origins of the text.

R. H. Charles asserts that Adoil might be derived from Hebrew, יד אל, translated as «The hand of God».[85] M. Philonenko supports this etymology pointing to some Egyptian parallels in which «les premières créatures nais-

[79] **каменіе**.

[80] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 149.

[81] **Ѧдоилъ**.

[82] **вѣка великаго**. It can be also translated as «a great aeon».

[83] **Ѧрꙋхазъ**.

[84] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 143–145.

[85] APOT. Vol. 2. 445.

sent du liquide séminal que le démiurge solitaire avait fait jaillir au moyen de sa main».[86]

L. Gry suggests reading Adoil as אור אל, «the light of God». In his opinion, some letters in the Hebrew word אור, «light», were transformed. *Resh* was changed into *daleth*. *Waw* was transposed. As a result of these transformations, it sounds like Adoil.[87]

A. Vaillant suggests that the name might be derived from a Hebrew word עד with a suffix, «his eternity, his aeon».[88] G. Scholem criticizes this rendering and shows that in Hebrew the word עד has the peculiar characteristic of being unable to carry a pronominal suffix.[89] According to Scholem's own interpretation Adoil derives from Sadoqil.[90]

J. Milik considers the name Adoil as «a Greek and Semitic hybrid: Hades + El».[91] G. Quispel derives it from *Adonai-el*, where the first element is the circumlocution for the Tetragrammaton.[92]

Another proper name in the narrative, Arukhaz, also poses several problems for interpretation. R. H. Charles believes that Arukhaz may have originated from the Hebrew word רקיע («firmament»).[93]

A. Vaillant supports the view that the term «Arukhaz» is connected with the image of foundation (Greek, στερέωμα; Hebrew, רקיע). In his opinion it was composed from the Hebrew words ערוך «arranged» and עז «hard».[94]

J. Milik traced «Arukhaz» to the Hebrew feminine term ארוכה («geographical basin»), transcribed with the masculine flexional ending as Arukhaz.[95]

F. Andersen, while thinking that the name could probably be derived from the Greek word ἀρχή, points out that the ending -as, which is not Slavonic, is doubtful.[96] He opts for another translation that connects the name with a Hebrew word ערוך («extended»).[97]

However, some materials found in the *Zohar* might lead us to quite different interpretations of the names «Adoil» and «Arukhas». In the *Zohar* I, 17b

---

[86] Philonenko, La cosmogonie du «Livre des secrets d'Hénoch»… 114.

[87] See Gry, Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux… 201.

[88] Vaillant, Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch… xi.

[89] Scholem, Origins of the Kabbalah… 73.

[90] G. Scholem, Die Lehre vom «Gerechten» in der jüdischen Mystik // *Eranos-Jahrbuch* 27 (1958) 252.

[91] J. T. Milik, The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4 (Oxford, 1976) 113.

[92] Cf. Fossum, The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord… 288.

[93] APOT. Vol. 2. 445.

[94] Vaillant, Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch… xi–xii.

[95] Milik, The Books of Enoch… 113.

[96] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 144–145.

[97] Ibid. 145.

one may find some provocative material from the Account of Creation that describes the same stage in the story of creation which began, just as the passage of *2 Enoch*, with the idea of establishing a «foundation»:

> Let there be a firmament: i.e. let there be a gradual extension. Thereupon *El* (God), the «right cluster», *El Gadol* (Great God),[98] spread forth from the midst of the waters to complete this name *El* and to combine with this extension, and so *El* was extended into *Elohim* (=*El*+*H, Y, M*). These *H, Y, M*, extended and became reversed so as to form lower waters, *Y, M, H*. This extension which took place on the second day is the upper waters. The *hé, yod, mim*, form *hayam* (the sea), which the upper waters. The reversal of these letters, *yamah* (seaward), is the lower waters. When they were firmly established, all became one whole, and this name was extended to a number of places. The upper waters are male and the lower waters female. At first they were commingled,[99] but afterwards they were differentiated into upper and lower waters. This is the meaning of «*Elohim* upper waters», and this is the meaning of «*Adonai* lower waters»; and this is the meaning of upper *Hé* and lower *Hé*.[100]

First, the applicable correlation between this narrative and the passage of *2 Enoch* lies in the similarities between the name «Adail» which is spelled in the majority of Slavonic manuscripts as «Adoil»,[101] and אל גדול — *El gadol* (or *Gadol-el*, «the great one»). Let it be noted that the Slavonic text, after it introduces the name «Adoil», defines it as «the great one» **ѩдоилъ прѣвеликы ꙗѣло**[102] «Adoil, the great one»,[103] which, in Hebrew, is identical with his name.[104]

---

[98] אל גדול. Margaliot, ספר הזהר… Vol. 1. 34.

[99] Literally: «there were waters within waters» (הוו מים במים). Margaliot, ספר הזהר… Vol. 1. 34.

[100] Sperling, Simon, The Zohar… Vol. 1. 75.

[101] In the majority of MSS this name has a form Adoil (**ѩдоилъ**) with «o» in the middle of the word:

J — Adoil. Andersen, 2 Enoch… 144.

R — Adoil. Соколов, Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного… 1.25.

P — Adoilju. Ibid. 25.

U — Adoil'. Ibid. 117.

N — Idoil. Vaillant, Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch… 28.

B — Adoil'; Idoil'. Соколов, Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного… 91.

B^2 — Adoil. Ibid. 137.

Chr — Adoil'. Ibid. 150.

[102] Vaillant, Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch… 29–30.

[103] Andersen translated it as «extremely large».

[104] The title *El gadol*, «the great God», can be connected with the term «Great Aeon», which came out from the belly of «Great One» — *Adoil*. Compare also *Zohar*'s narrative: «At first there were waters within waters».

Second, the title *El Gadol* in the *Zohar* is identified with the upper waters. A similar correspondence can be found in *2 Enoch* where Adoil is matched with the upper foundation.

The same symmetrical pattern also shows in the case of Arukhaz: Arukhaz, the lower foundation in *2 Enoch*, and the «other extension», the lower waters in the *Zohar*. Both texts use the term «lower» in reference to Arukhaz. This term can serve as a clue to resolving the etymological mystery of this enigmatic name. The word «Arukhaz» in *2 Enoch* might be related to the Aramaic ארעיי, translated as «lower».[105] It is noteworthy that *Frg. Tg.* on Gen 1:6 uses this term in the expression «the lower waters» (מיא ארעאי).[106]

Conclusion

It would be helpful now to offer some concluding remarks about the Account of Creation in *2 Enoch*. These inferences will be concerned mainly with the form and the content of the examined textual material.

1. *2 Enoch* appears to contain a systematic tendency of treating the story of creation as containing the most esoteric knowledge. Even though *2 Enoch* deals with various meterological, astronomical, and cosmological revelations, it specifically emphasizes the «secrecy» of the account of creation. *2 Enoch*, unlike other early apocalyptic materials (such as the Book of Daniel and *1 Enoch*), does not include the variety of «revealed things» in the notion of «secrets».

2. *2 Enoch's* emphasis on the «secrecy» of the creation story demonstrates an intriguing parallel to the later rabbinic approach to מעשה בראשית as esoteric knowledge. *2 Enoch*, therefore, can be seen as an important step in the shaping of the later rabbinic understanding of «secret things», which eventually led to the esoterism of the Account of Creation.

3. The Account of Creation in *2 Enoch* includes the cosmogonic motifs of God's creation of the primordial order. These descriptions show a number of parallels with late Jewish mysticism, namely the Zoharic tradition. It supports the Box-Odeberg hypothesis, that the creation narrative of the longer recension shows a presentment of some of the Zoharic ideas of creation. At this stage of our research, it is difficult to determine whether these blocks of the Account of Creation are interpolations during the later stages of transmission or whether they belong to the original layer of the text.

4. The story of Creation appears to be more developed in the manuscripts of the longer recension. To illustrate this fact, we could point to the important description of the creation of Adam[107] in chapters 30–32, which are absent in

[105] M. Sokoloff, A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic (Ramat-Gan, 1990) 77.
[106] Ibid.
[107] Cf. Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism... 51.

the manuscripts of the shorter recension. It supports Andersen's position that «the claims of the longer recension need special attention in the sections dealing with creation, chapters 24–33».[108]

ABSTRACT

The article explores the theme of the secrets of creation in *2 Enoch*. The Slavonic pseudepigraphon appears to contain a systematic tendency of treating the story of creation as containing the most esoteric knowledge. Even though *2 Enoch* deals with various meterological, astronomical, and cosmological revelations, it specifically emphasizes the «secrecy» of the account of creation. *2 Enoch's* emphasis on the «secrecy» of the creation story demonstrates an intriguing parallel to the later rabbinic approach to מעשה בראשית as esoteric knowledge. *2 Enoch*, therefore, can be seen as an important step in the shaping of the later rabbinic understanding of «secret things», which eventually led to the esoterism of the Account of Creation.

[108] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 94.

Andrei A. Orlov
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

THE HEIRS OF THE ENOCHIC LORE: «MEN OF FAITH» IN *2 ENOCH* 35:2 AND *SEFER HEKHALOT* 48D:10[1]

> Make public the twenty-four books that you wrote first and let the worthy and the unworthy read them; but keep the seventy that were written last, in order to give them to the wise among your people. For in them is the spring of understanding, the fountain of wisdom, and the river of knowledge.
>
> *4 Ezra* 14

Enoch and Moses

Chapter 35 of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse apparently written in the first century CE, unveils the story of the transmission of the Enochic scriptures and their important role in the last generation.[2] In *2 Enoch* 35:1–3 the Lord gives Enoch the following instruction about the destiny of his handwritings:

> And I will leave a righteous man from your tribe, together with all his house, who will act according to my will. And from his seed another generation will arise, the last of many, and very gluttonous. Then at the conclusion of that generation the books in your handwriting will be revealed, and those of your fathers, and the earthly guardians (**стражие земнии**) [of these books] will show them to the Men of Faith (**моужемь вѣрнымь**).

[1] Part of this paper was read at the Annual Meeting of SBL/AAR, San Antonio, 23–26 November 2004.

[2] A word must be said about the complex nature of the Slavonic text of this chapter. Francis Andersen observes that «very little is claimed for the translation of ch. 35 in either recension. The texts are parallel, but the numerous minor variations and uncertainty over the clause boundaries make all MSS rather unintelligible». He further suggests that «in the present stage of research all individual readings should be kept in mind as options». F. I. Andersen, 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 158. A close analysis of the Slavonic text in both recensions demonstrates that the shorter recension appears to have preserved the material in a more coherent form.

> And they will be recounted to that generation, and they will be glorified in the end more than in the beginning. *2 Enoch* 35:1–3 (shorter recension).[3]

The important detail of this account is that the transmission of the Enochic scriptures on earth will enable the earthly guardians of the books to convey the patriarch's writings to the Men of Faith (моужемь вѣрнъıм).[4] The reference to the group «Men of Faith» as the last link in the chain of transmission of the Enochic scriptures is important for connecting the Slavonic apocalypse with the later Jewish mysticism since it attests to the terminology found in *Sefer Hekhalot*, also known as *3 Enoch*, a later Enochic text, preserved in a corpus of Hekhalot writings. In *3 Enoch* 48D:10 (*Synopse* § 80) the Torah is initially given by Enoch-Metatron to Moses and then passed through the chain of transmission which eventually brings this revelation into the hands of the group designated as the Men of Faith. The passage reads:

> Metatron brought Torah out from my storehouses and committed it to Moses, and Moses to Joshua, Joshua to the Elders, the Elders to the Prophets, the Prophets to the Men of the Great Synagogue, the Men of the Great Synagogue to Ezra the Scribe, Ezra the Scribe to Hillel the Elder, Hillel the Elder to R. Abbahu, R. Abbahu to R. Zira, R. Zira to the Men of Faith, and the Men of Faith to the Faithful (לאנשי אמונה ואנשי אמונה אמונות לבעלי).[5]

Scholars have previously noted that this succession of the mystical tradition recalls the chain of transmission of the oral law preserved in *Pirke Abot*, the *Sayings of the Fathers*.[6] *m.* Abot 1:1 reads:

> Moses received the Law from Sinai and committed it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the Prophets; and the Prophets committed it to the men of the Great Synagogue. They said three things: Be deliberate in judgment, raise up many disciples, and make a fence around the Law.[7]

---

[3] М. И. Соколов, Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий, VII: Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного / Тексты, латинский пер. и исследование. Посмертный труд автора приготовил к изд. М. Сперанский // *ЧОИДР* 4 (1910) 1.93.

[4] This expression is attested in the MSS of both recensions. See ibid. 1.35 and 1.93.

[5] P. Alexander, 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 315; P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H. G. von Mutius, Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur (Tübingen, 1981) (TSAJ, 2) § 80.

[6] Alexander, 3 Enoch... 315; M. Swartz, Scholastic Magic: Ritual and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism (Princeton, 1996) 188.

[7] H. Danby, The Mishnah (Oxford, 1992) 446.

The Hekhalot writer reworks the traditional Mishnaic arrangement of prophets, rabbis, and sages by placing at the beginning of the chain the figure of Enoch-Metatron, posed there as the initial revealer. As the final heirs of this revelation, he adds an enigmatic group whom he designates as the Men of Faith. These Men of Faith (אנשי אמונה), along with the Faithful (בעל י אמונה),[8] represent the last link in the chain of the transmission to whom the Torah will be eventually handed. This group is unknown in *Pirke Abot* (PA) and similar clusters of the early traditions attested in *Abot d' R. Nathan* (PRN).[9] These designations similar to the one found in *2 Enoch* help to strengthen the hypothesis proposed by Gershom Scholem and other scholars that *2 Enoch* contains the earliest formulations of Jewish mystical developments.

Philip Alexander suggests that the expression «Men of Faith» (אנשי אמונה) and the «Faithful» (בעל י אמונה) found in *Sefer Hekhalot* «appear to be quasi-technical terms for the mystics».[10] Michael Swartz offers a similar hypothesis proposing that the enigmatic Men of Faith and the Faithful, who occupy the last place in the line of transmission in *Sefer Hekhalot* 48D, may refer to either the mystics themselves or to their mythic ancestors.[11] Both Alexander[12] and Swartz note that the term בעל י אמונה appeared among the synonyms for the group of mystics in a hymn in *Hekhalot Rabbati*. The hymn connects the divine attribute with the designation of the group.[13]

It is intriguing that in *2 Enoch*, as in the Hekhalot passage, Enoch-Metatron's revelation will also be handed eventually to the Men of Faith (**моужемь вѣрнъıм**).[14] In light of the Hekhalot evidence, this reference may hold the

[8] Swartz renders this term as the «Possessors of the Faith». See Swartz, Scholastic Magic... 179.

[9] On the chain of tradition in *Pirke Abot* and *Abot d' R. Nathan* see: E. Bickerman, La chaîne de la tradition pharisienne // *RB* 59 (1951) 44–54; L. Finkelstein, Introductory Study to Pirke Abot // *JBL* 57 (1938) 13–50; A. J. Saldarini, The End of the Rabbinic Chain of Tradition // *JBL* 93 (1974) 97–106; idem, Scholastic Rabbinism: A Literary Study of the Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan (Chico, Calif., 1982).

[10] Alexander, 3 Enoch... 315, note v.

[11] Swartz observes that «it is likely that these terms refer either to the mystics themselves, or, perhaps, mythic ancestors patterned after Elders and the Men of the Great Assembly and influenced by the appearance of terms such as אנשי אמונה in talmudic literature». Swartz, Scholastic Magic... 188.

[12] Alexander also observes that in the *Alphabet of R. Aqiba* (A. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash. 6 vols. (Jerusalem, 1967) Vol. 3. 29) «"the men of faith" constitute a distinct category of the righteous in the world to come». Alexander, 3 Enoch... 315, note v.

[13] Alexander, 3 Enoch... 315, note v; Swartz, Scholastic Magic... 188.

[14] It appears that the expression found in *2 Enoch* 35:2 can be related to both designations since the Slavonic **моужемь вѣрнъıм** can be translated also as the Faithful (men).

key to the enigma of the early designation of the mysterious group which stands behind the early Jewish mystical speculations reflected in *2 Enoch*. It is significant that the designation of the ultimate receptors of the esoteric lore is identical in both traditions. The Hekhalot reference may, therefore, have an Enochic provenance. Despite the fact that the reference to the chain of transmission is repeated several times in the Hekhalot literature, the reference to the Men of Faith and the Faithful in the chain is made only in the «Enochic» passage from *3 Enoch* 48D.[15] It is possible that the author of the passage combines the two traditions by adding to the mishnaic line of transmission reflected in *Pirke Abot* and *Abot de Rabbi Nathan* a new Enochic group, similar to those found in *2 Enoch* 35. The table below illustrates these combinations:

2 Enoch 35:2	*m.* Abot 1:1	*Synopse* § 80
Then at the conclusion of that generation the books in your handwriting will be revealed, and those of your fathers,	Moses received the Law from Sinai and committed it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the Prophets; and the Prophets committed it to the men of the Great Synagogue...	Metatron brought it [Torah] out from my storehouses and committed it to Moses, and Moses to Joshua, Joshua to the Elders, the Elders to the Prophets, the Prophets to the Men of the Great Synagogue, the Men of the Great Synagogue to Ezra the Scribe, Ezra the Scribe to Hillel the Elder, Hillel the Elder to R. Abbahu, R. Abbahu to R. Zira, R. Zira to the Men of Faith, and the Men of Faith to the Faithful.
and the earthly guardians [of these books] will show them to the Men of Faith.	...make a fence around the Law.	

It is also noteworthy that the Enochic influences are now apparent not only in the end of this newly-constructed chain but also in its beginning, where the figure of the translated patriarch is hidden behind the name of the exalted angel Metatron who passes the initial revelation to Moses. In such a perspective the Mosaic successors and Moses himself represent only intermediate temporal guardians whose role is to pass the revealed knowledge into the hands of its true owners, the heirs of the Enochic tradition.[16]

[15] For the detailed analysis of this evidence see Swartz, Scholastic Magic... 178ff.

[16] In this respect *2 Enoch* 35 operates with the concept of the «earthly guardians» (**стражие земнии**) as the agents responsible for handling Enoch's writings until they finally are brought into the hands of the «Men of Faith». The expression «earthly

An important detail of *3 Enoch's* account is its anti-Mosaic flavor: the authors of the passage from *Sefer Hekhalot* try to diminish the importance of Moses and the transmitters of the Mosaic Torah by depicting the son of Amram in a role inferior to Enoch-Metatron from whom Moses receives his revelation. Scholars previously noted that this tendency to depict Metatron as a greater Moses was widespread in the Merkabah accounts. Several years ago David Halperin in his book *The Faces of the Chariot*[17] demonstrated the popularity of such comparative imagery, which reflects the polemical character of the Merkabah portrayals of Moses and Metatron. He noted that in these materials Metatron is always depicted as «a greater Moses ... more exactly, he is Moses gone a step farther. Moses ascends to heaven; Metatron becomes ruler of heaven. Moses defeats the angels; Metatron dominates them. Moses grasps God's throne; Metatron sits on a throne identical to it. When Metatron grants revelation to Moses, he is giving a helping hand to his junior alter ego.... These authors ... saw the exalted Metatron as the primary figure, the ascending Moses as his junior replica».[18]

Halperin's work sees the initial background of the Merkabah polemical comparisons between the son of Amram and Metatron in Moses' ascension stories reflected in the rabbinic materials associated with the *Shabuᶜot* circle.[19] He suggested that «as historians of the tradition ... we must reverse the relationships [between Moses and Metatron]. First the *Shabuᶜot* preachers had Moses invade heaven and lay hold of the throne. Then the authors of the Hekhalot, breaking the restraints of the older stories, let Metatron enjoy the fruits of conquest».[20]

Still, despite Halperin's suggestions about the formative value and primacy of the rabbinic *Shabuᶜot* testimonies for Moses-Metatron polemical interactions, it is possible that already in the Second Temple Enochic materials, namely in *2 Enoch*, the Enochic authors attempted to portray the Mosaic hero as a junior replica of Enoch-Metatron.

In my previously published articles, I argued that *2 Enoch* reveals an intricate web of the mediatorial debates in the course of which several traditions about exalted patriarchs and prophets prominent in the Second Temple Judaism, including Adam, Noah, and Moses, underwent polemical appropriation when their exalted features were transferred to the seventh antediluvian

guardians» might reflect a polemic with the Mosaic notion of the transmission and preservation of the revelation as «guarding». Among other places, such a concept is reflected in the famous rabbinic saying from *m.* Abot 1:1 where the preserving of the tradition is designated as «making the fence around the Torah».

[17] D. J. Halperin, The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision (Tübingen, 1988) (TSAJ 16).

[18] Ibid. 426.

[19] Ibid. 289ff.

[20] Ibid. 426.

hero.[21] These polemical trends seem to reflect the familiar atmosphere of the mediatorial interactions widespread in the Second Temple period which offered contending accounts for the primacy and supremacy of their exalted heroes. The polemics found in *2 Enoch* are part of these debates and represent a response of the Enochic tradition to the challenges of its exalted rivals.

In my previous work I tried to show that in *2 Enoch* many theophanic features of Moses' story were transferred to Enoch.[22] Two of such prominent characteristics are the motifs of the glorious face of the seventh antediluvian hero and his encounter with the Deity's hand during his celestial metamorphosis. Our study must now proceed to the investigation of these two motifs in *2 Enoch's* materials.

Luminous Face of Enoch

From the Slavonic apocalypse one learns that the vision of the divine Face has dramatic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endures radical changes as it becomes covered with the divine light. In Enoch's radiant metamorphosis before the divine Countenance, an important detail can be found which further links Enoch's transformation with Moses' account in the Book of Exodus. In *2 Enoch* 37 one learns about the unusual procedure performed on Enoch's face at the final stage of his encounter with the Lord. The text informs us that the Lord called one of his senior angels to chill the face of Enoch. The text says that the angel was «terrifying and frightful», and appeared frozen; he was as white as snow, and his hands were as cold as ice. With these cold hands he then chilled the patriarch's face. Right after this chilling procedure, the Lord informs Enoch that if his face had not been chilled here, no human being would have been able to look at him.[23] This reference to the dangerous radiance of Enoch's face after his encounter with the Lord is an apparent parallel to the incandescent face of Moses after the Sinai experience in Exodus 34.[24]

Exodus 34:29–35 portrays Moses after his encounter with the Lord. The passage relates that

> Moses came down from Mount Sinai .... Moses did not know that the skin of his face shone because he had been talking with God. When Aaron and

[21] A. Orlov, «Noah's Younger Brother»: Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch // *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259–273; idem, Melchizedek Legend of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* // *JSJ* 31 (2000) 23–38; idem, Noah's Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noachic Polemics and the Date of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* // *Henoch* 26.2 (2004) 172–187.

[22] A. Orlov, Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition // *SBLSP* 39 (2000) 130–147.

[23] Andersen, 2 Enoch... 160.

[24] *Apoc. Paul* 20 describes Enoch as the scribe of righteousness whose face shines «as the sun».

> all the Israelites saw Moses, the skin of his face was shining, and they were afraid to come near him... and Moses would put the veil on his face again, until he went in to speak with him.

This passage unambiguously constitutes the Mosaic background of the tradition found in *2 Enoch* 37, where Enoch's face is depicted as similar to Moses' face who shields his luminous visage with a veil. The transference of the Mosaic motif into the framework of the Enochic tradition is made here for the first time. It is also obvious that this transferal has a polemical character. Passing on to the patriarch such a salient detail of the biblical story would immediately invoke in the Enochic readers the memory of Moses' example. Such transference also intends to demonstrate that Moses' encounter at Sinai and his luminous face represent later, inferior imitations of the primeval account of the patriarch's vision, a vision which occurred not on earth but in heaven in the antediluvian time.

The polemical appropriation of the Mosaic motif of the seer's radiant face is not confined in *2 Enoch* solely to the encounter with the «frozen» angel, but is reflected also in other sections of the book. According to the Slavonic apocalypse, despite the chilling procedure performed in heaven, Enoch's face appears to have retained its transformative power and is even able to glorify other human subjects. In *2 Enoch* 64:2 people ask the transformed Enoch for blessings so they can be glorified in front of his face.[25] This theme of the transforming power of the patriarch's visage may also have a polemical flavor.

The theme of the luminous countenance of the seer is also important for the ongoing discussion of the Enoch-Metatron connection. It should not be forgotten that *2 Enoch's* appropriation of the Mosaic imagery serves as the formative framework for the later Enoch-Metatron accounts, and especially for the one reflected in the so-called additional chapters[26] of *Sefer Hekhalot*. In these chapters the theme of the luminosity of Moses' face and Metatron's visage are also put in a polemical juxtaposition. From *3 Enoch* 15B one learns that it is Enoch-Metatron, whose face was once transformed into fire, who tells Moses about his shining visage:[27] «At once Metatron, Prince of the Di-

[25] See *2 Enoch* 64:4 (the longer recension): «And now bless your [sons], and all the people, so that we may be glorified in front of your face today». Andersen, 2 Enoch... 190.

[26] For a critical assessment of the theory of «core» and «additions» in *Sefer Hekhalot*, consult P. Schäfer, Handschriften zur Hekhalot-Literatur // idem, Hekhalot Studien (Tübingen, 1988) (TSAJ, 19) 228–229; P. Schäfer et al., Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literatur. 4 vols (Tübingen, 1987–1995) (TSAJ, 17, 22, 29, 46) Vol. 1. LI.

[27] Scholars have observed that in the Merkabah tradition Metatron is explicitly identified as the hypostatic Face of God. See, for example, Schäfer, Synopse... §§ 396–397: «...The Lord of all the worlds warned Moses that he should beware of his face. So it is written, "Beware of his face"... This is the prince who is called Yofiel Yahdariel... he is called Metatron». On Metatron as the hypostatic Face of God see A. De

vine Presence, said to Moses, "Son of Amram, fear not! for already God favors you. Ask what you will with confidence and boldness, for light shines from the skin of your face from one end of the world to the other"».[28] Here Moses is portrayed as a later version of his master Enoch-Metatron whose face and body were transformed into blazing fire long before the prophet's ascension at Sinai.[29]

The Lord's Hand

It is possible that the new theophanic imagery transferred to the Enochic hero in the Slavonic apocalypse might derive not only from the biblical accounts of the Sinai encounter, but also from the extra-biblical Mosaic stories in which the profile of the exalted prophet has a more advanced form. The authors of *2 Enoch* may have been carefully following here the theological unfolding of the story of their rival and the enhancement of his profile as an elevated figure. The familiarity of Enochic authors with the Second Temple extra-biblical Mosaic accounts can be illustrated through an examination of the motif of the Deity's hand; this hand embraces and protects the seer during his encounter with the Lord in the upper realm.

In *2 Enoch* 39 the patriarch relates to his children that during his vision of the divine *Kavod*, the Lord helped him with his right hand. The hand here is described as having a gigantic size and filling heaven: «But you, my children, see the right hand of one who helps you, a human being created identical to yourself, but I have seen the right hand of the Lord, *helping me* (**помагающоу ми**) and *filling heaven* (**испльнѣающоу небо**)».[30] The theme of the hand of God assisting the seer during his vision of the Face recalls the Mosaic account from Exodus 33:22–23. Here the Deity promises the prophet to protect him with his hand during the encounter with the divine *Panim*: «and while

---

Conick, Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First-Century Christology in the Second Century // The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism / Eds. C. C. Newman, J. R. Davila, G. S. Lewis (Leiden, 1999) (JSJSup, 63) 329; Halperin, The Faces of the Chariot… 424–425.

[28] *3 Enoch* 15B:5. Alexander, 3 Enoch... 304. See also *Raza Rabbah,* where again a similar connection is made between Metatron's face and Moses' visage.

[29] Schäfer, Synopse… § 19 (*3 Enoch* 15:1) depicts this radiant metamorphosis of Enoch–Metatron: «When the Holy One, blessed be he, took me to serve the throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all the needs of the Shekinah, at once my flesh turned to flame, my sinews to blazing fire, my bones to juniper coals, my eyelashes to lightning flashes, my eyeballs to fiery torches, the hairs of my head to hot flames, all my limbs to wings of burning fire, and the substance of my body to blazing fire». Alexander, 3 Enoch... 267.

[30] *2 Enoch* 39:5. Andersen, 2 Enoch… 162; Соколов, Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного… 1.38.

my glory passes by I will put you in a cleft of the rock, and I will cover you with my hand until I have passed by; then I will take away my hand, and you shall see my back; but my face shall not be seen». There is also another early Mosaic account where the motif of the divine hand assisting the visionary is mentioned. The *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian[31] relates that during the prophet's vision of the *Kavod*, a noble man sitting on the throne beckoned him with his right hand (δεξιᾷ δέ μοι ἔνευσε).[32]

It is conceivable that *2 Enoch's* description is closer to the form of the tradition preserved in Ezekiel the Tragedian than to the account found in Exodus since the *Exagoge* mentions the right hand of the Deity beckoning the seer. The passage from the Slavonic apocalypse also mentions the right hand of the Lord. Further there is another terminological parallel that unifies the two accounts. While the longer recension of *2 Enoch* uses the term «helping» (**помагающюу**) in reference to the divine hand, some manuscripts of the shorter recension employ the word «beckoning» (**помавающи**), the term used in the *Exagoge*.

The terminological affinities between the *Exagoge* and *2 Enoch* point to the possibility that the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse, in their development of the theme of the divine hand, were relying not only on the tradition preserved in Exodus but also on more advanced Mosaic speculations similar to those found in Ezekiel the Tragedian.

Although *2 Enoch's* description is very similar to the *Exagoge*'s passage, the Slavonic apocalypse has a more advanced version of the mystical image-

[31] This significant early testimony to the exalted profile of Moses has survived as a part of the drama *Exagoge*, a writing attributed to Ezekiel the Tragedian. The account depicts the prophet's experience at Sinai as his celestial enthronement. *Exagoge* 67–90 reads: «Moses: I had a vision of a great throne (θρόνον μέγαν) on the top of Mount Sinai and it reached till the folds of heaven. A noble man was sitting on it, with a crown and a large scepter (μέγα σκῆπτρον) in his left hand. He beckoned to me with his right hand, so I approached and stood before the throne. He gave me the scepter and instructed me to sit on the great throne. Then he gave me a royal crown and got up from the throne. I beheld the whole earth all around and saw beneath the earth and above the heavens. A multitude of stars fell before my knees and I counted them all. They paraded past me like a battalion of men. Then I awoke from my sleep in fear. Raguel: My friend (ὦ ξένε), this is a good sign from God. May I live to see the day when these things are fulfilled. You will establish a great throne, become a judge and leader of men. As for your vision of the whole earth, the world below and that above the heavens — this signifies that you will see what is, what has been and what shall be». H. Jacobson, The Exagoge of Ezekiel (Cambridge, 1983) 54–55. Wayne Meeks observes that, given its quotation by Alexander Polyhistor (ca. 80–40 B.C.E.), this Mosaic account can be taken as a witness to traditions of the second century B.C.E. W. Meeks, The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology (Leiden, 1967) (SNT, 14) 149.

[32] Jacobson, The Exagoge of Ezekiel... 54.

ry; this imagery demonstrates close parallels to the symbolism of the Merkabah lore. The important detail here is that the divine hand is described as «filling heaven» (исплънѣѧщоу небо).[33] This description recalls the language of the *Shiʿur Qomah* accounts, in which Metatron reveals to Rabbi Ishmael and Rabbi Akiba the knowledge of the gigantic limbs of the Deity, limbs which fill heaven. It has already been noted that the allusion to this mystical imagery in the Slavonic apocalypse does not appear to be happenstance since it is incorporated there into a series of analogical comparisons between Enoch's body and the Lord's body. These portrayals recall the later Hekhalot and *Shiʿur Qomah* accounts in which Enoch-Metatron is often portrayed as possessing the gigantic body himself.

The motif of the Lord's hand, prominent in the early Enochic account, is not forgotten in the Merkabah materials, where one can learn that «the hand of God rests on the head of the youth, named Metatron».[34] The motif of the divine hand assisting Enoch-Metatron during his celestial transformation is present in *Sefer Hekhalot*, where it appears in the form of tradition very similar to the evidence found in the *Exagoge* and *2 Enoch*. In *Synopse* § 12 Metatron tells R. Ishmael that during the transformation of his body into the gigantic cosmic extent, matching the world in length and breadth, God «laid his hand» on the translated hero.[35] Here, just as in the Slavonic account, the hand of the Deity signifies the bond between the seer's body and the divine corporeality.

In *Sefer Hekhalot* the imagery of God's hand is also conflated with the Mosaic tradition. In *Synopse* § 68 Enoch-Metatron unveils to Rabbi Ishmael the hypostatic right hand of God with which «955 heavens were created». This introduction of the divine hand is interwoven in *Synopse* §§ 68–69[36] into an elaborate set of references to Moses, to whom, according to the text, the mighty hand of God was once revealed. The author alludes to the passage from Isa 63:12, in which the Deity sends his glorious arm to be at Moses' right hand, as well as other Mosaic biblical themes. Although the name of the Israelite prophet is mentioned six times in this text, nothing is said about his exalted profile. It would seem appropriate there, since the main hero of this account is not Moses but the translated patriarch, who now unveils the mysteries of the divine hand to the visionary.

Moreover it seems that, in *Synopse* §§ 77–80,[37] Enoch-Metatron is understood, at least implicitly, as the hypostatic hand of the Deity himself. These

[33] Соколов, Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного… 1.38.

[34] Schäfer, Synopse… § 384.

[35] «…the Holy One, blessed be he, laid his hand on me and blessed me with 1,365,000 blessings. I was enlarged and increased in size until I matched the world in length and breadth». Alexander, 3 Enoch... 263.

[36] *3 Enoch* 48A.

[37] *3 Enoch* 48D.

materials depict the translated patriarch as the helping hand of God; with this helping hand God passes the Torah to the Mosaic hero and protects him against the hostility of angelic hosts.

After this short excursus into the theophanic polemical appropriations let us now return to our passage about the Men of Faith found in *Sefer Hekhalot* 48 where Enoch-Metatron is depicted as a revealer superior to Moses.

As I mentioned earlier, it appears that the main point of the polemical interactions in *3 Enoch* 48 is to assert the supremacy of Enoch-Metatron as the revealer of Torah and the primacy of his revelation before the disclosure given to Moses. It is possible that the polemics about the primacy of the Enochic Torah before the Torah of Moses can be already seen in *2 Enoch*, a text which in many ways anticipates *Sefer Hekhalot* developments and where one can find a similar terminology pertaining to the enigmatic group of the «Men of Faith» to whom the Enochic books will be eventually given.

Enoch's Revelation

The theme of Enochic revelation as the disclosure alternative to the Mosaic Torah looms large in chapters 24–32 of the Slavonic Enoch. In these chapters the reader encounters a lengthy narrative of God's revelation to the exalted patriarch about the seven days of creation. It depicts the Deity dictating to his celestial scribe, the patriarch Enoch, the account of creation organized in almost the same fashion as the first chapter of the biblical Genesis. The Lord starts his narration with the familiar phrase «in the beginning»: «Before anything existed at all, from the very beginning (**испръва**),[38] whatever exists I created from the non-existent, and from the invisible». Although the very first line of the narration brings to memory the beginning of the Mosaic Torah, the creational account itself is quite different from the one reflected in the biblical Genesis. The story contains imagery pertaining to the primeval order and to the creation of humanity that is completely missing from the biblical text. Although the Enochic scribes try to preserve the structural grid of the Genesis story by organizing it around the seven days of creation, the plot is greatly expanded with new striking details and unknown characters, among whom one can find, for example, the cosmogonic figures designated as Adoil and Arukhas. The structure of this narration, involving the seven days of creation looks odd and disproportional in comparison with its biblical counterpart. Still, the composers of this peculiar version of the alternative Genesis[39] try to hold on to the familiar organization that replaces

[38] Соколов, Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного… 1.24.

[39] The «alternative» thrust of *2 Enoch*'s creational account is so transparent that the editors of the *Other Bible* included this Enochic narrative as the non-canonical counterpart of the first chapters of Genesis.

the memory of its Mosaic version. It is clearly fashioned as an alternative intended to overwrite an essential part of the Mosaic revelation. It is significant that despite the Enochic authors' attempt to deconstruct the well-known ancient account, the purported antediluvian reception of their disclosure speaks for itself, silently postulating the primacy of this revelation over the one received several generations later by Moses on Mount Sinai. It is also important that unlike in *1 Enoch*, in the Slavonic apocalypse God reveals to the seer not simply astronomical information or a warning about the upcoming judgment, but a disclosure fashioned in form and structure similarly to the Mosaic Torah. The mode of reception is also different since the revelation is received not simply as a seer's dream, similar to the vision of the Biblical history in the *Animal Apocalypse*, but as directly dictated by God.

The chapters following the creation account in *2 Enoch* 24–32 are also important for our discussion since they convey knowledge about the function and the future role of this alternative version of the first chapters of the Mosaic Torah. From *2 Enoch* 33:8–12 one learns that the revelation recorded by Enoch will be transmitted from generation to generation and it will not be destroyed until the final age. The two following chapters (*2 Enoch* 34 and 35) also pertain to the themes of God's revelation to Enoch and the destiny of his books. The theme of the Enochic books is conflated here with the notions of the yoke and the commandments: after informing the seer that his handwritings and the handwritings of his ancestors will not perish in the upcoming flood, God reminds the seer about the wickedness of humans who have rejected the divine commandments and are not willing to carry the yoke (**ѣрмо**)[40] which the Deity placed on them. It is curious that the terminology of «yoke» and «commandments» follows here the theme of Enochic writings. Scholars have previously proposed that the term «yoke» might be reserved here for the Torah. Celia Deutsch observes that «the yoke here refers to Torah, as is indicated by its use with "commandments"».[41] She also notes that this theme is further expanded in *2 Enoch* 48:9, where it includes the teaching received by Enoch and transmitted through the revealed books.[42] In *2 Enoch* 48:9 the author of the Slavonic apocalypse is openly connecting the patriarch's scriptures with the notion of the «yoke», which serves here as an alternative designation for the Torah,[43] the Torah of Enoch.

---

[40] Соколов, Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного… 1.34.

[41] C. Deutsch, Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25–30 (Sheffield, 1987) (JSNTSS, 18) 116.

[42] Ibid.

[43] It should be noted that although *2 Enoch* 34 and *2 Enoch* 48 use two different terms for «yoke» (*2 Enoch 34* uses **ѣрмо** and *2 Enoch* 48 uses **иго**), both of these Slavonic words designate the same concept. Thus, Sreznevskij's dictionary relates both **ѣрмо** and **иго** to the Greek ζυγός and the Latin *iugum*. И. Срезневский, Словарь

Conclusion

In view of the polemical interactions between Enochic and Mosaic traditions detected in the Slavonic apocalypse, one no longer needs to follow David Halperin's advice by clarifying the relationships between Moses and Enoch-Metatron on the basis of the later rabbinic testimonies to the *Shabu^{c}ot* circle. Already in the Second Temple materials, specifically in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*, Enochic authors sought to portray the Mosaic hero as a junior replica of Enoch-Metatron and his revelation as the disclosure inferior to the one received by the seventh antediluvian patriarch. The passage from *Sefer Hekhalot* 48D:10 also attests to this long-lasting rivalry between Moses and Enoch. Yet in comparison with the author of *2 Enoch*, the task of the Hekhalot author seems more complex — he cannot simply overwrite the Mosaic Torah, keeping silence about its revealer, as did the Enochic authors of the Slavonic pseudepigraphon. He must reconcile the two revelations. This is why in his version of the story, the Men of Faith become a link in the familiar Mosaic line of rabbis, sages, and prophets.

ABSTRACT

2 Enoch 35 unveils a tradition according to which the Enochic writings will be eventually handled by the books' guardians to a group designated as the Men of Faith. The reference to the group as the last link in the chain of transmission of the Enochic scriptures recalls the terminology attested in the later «Enochic» material appended to some manuscripts of Sefer Hekhalot and known as Chapter 48D of 3 Enoch. In this account the revelation which is initially given by Enoch-Metatron to Moses passes through several transmissions into the hands of people named the Men of Faith. Scholars have previously suggested that this designation in the Hekhalot passage appears to function as a quasi-technical term for the mystics or their mythic ancestors. In this context the designation reflected in *2 Enoch* may hold the key to the enigma of the Enochic group(s) standing behind the early Jewish mystical speculations.

древнерусского языка. 3 тома (Москва, 1989) Т. 1. 1019; Т. 3. 1663. Barchudarov's dictionary also lists the two terms as synonyms. Словарь русского языка XI–XVII веков / Ред. С. Г. Бархударов. 25 тт. (Москва, 1975ff) Т. 6. 78–79; Slovnik Jazyka Staroslovenskeho (Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae) / Ed. J. Kurz. 4 vols. (Prague, 1966) Vol. 1. 703.

Andrei A. Orlov
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

NOAH'S YOUNGER BROTHER REVISITED: ANTI-NOACHIC POLEMICS AND THE DATE OF *2 (SLAVONIC) ENOCH*

Several years ago, in an article published in the *Henoch*, I argued that *2 Enoch* contains systematic polemics against the priestly Noachic tradition.[1] My study tried to demonstrate that in the course of these polemics the exalted features of Noah's story, such as his miraculous birth, his leading roles as the originator of animal sacrificial practice and a bridge over the Flood become transferred to other characters of the Slavonic apocalypse including Methuselah, Nir, who defined in the story as «Noah's younger brother», and his miraculously born child Melchisedek.[2] The analysis showed that the trans-

[1] A. Orlov, «Noah's Younger Brother»: Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch // *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259–273.

[2] Noachic polemics take place in the last chapters of the Slavonic apocalypse (chs 68–72). In this section of the pseudepigraphon we learn that, immediately after Enoch's instructions to his sons during his short visit to the earth and his ascension to the highest heaven, the firstborn son of Enoch, Methuselah, and his brothers, the sons of Enoch, constructed an altar at Achuzan, the place where Enoch had been taken up. In *2 Enoch* 69 the Lord appeared to Methuselah in a night vision and appointed him as priest before the people. Verses 11–16 of this chapter describe the first animal sacrifice of Methuselah on the altar. The text gives an elaborate description of the sacrificial ritual during which Methuselah slaughters with a knife, «in the required manner», sheep and oxen placed at the head of the altar. All these sheep and oxen are tied according to the sectarian instructions given by Enoch earlier in the book. Chapter 70 of *2 Enoch* recounts the last days of Methuselah on earth before his death. The Lord appeared to Methuselah in a night vision and commanded him to pass his priesthood duties on to the second son of Lamech, the previously unknown Nir. The text does not explain why the Lord wanted to pass the priesthood to Nir instead of Noah (Lamech's firstborn son), even though Noah is also mentioned in the dream. Further, the book tells that Methuselah invested Nir with the vestments of priesthood before the face of all the people and «made him stand at the head of the altar». The account of the sacerdotal practices of Enoch's relatives then continues with the Melchisedek story. The content of the story is connected with Nir's family. Sothonim, Nir's wife, gave birth to a child «in her old age», right «on the day of her death». She conceived the child, «being sterile» and «without having slept with her husband». The book narrated that Nir the priest had not slept with her from the day that the Lord had appointed him in front of the face of the people. Therefore, Sothonim hid herself during all the days of her pregnancy. Finally, when she was at the day of birth, Nir remembered his wife and called her to himself in the temple. She came to him and he

ferences of Noah's features and achievements to other characters were intended to diminish the extraordinary role traditionally assigned to the hero of the Flood in the crucial juncture of the primeval history.

While demonstrating the existence of the Noahic polemics my previous study did not fully explain the purpose of these polemics. Why did Noah, who traditionally is viewed as the main ally of the seventh antedeluvian hero in the early Enochic booklets, suddenly become devalued by the Enochic tradition? In this current investigation I will try to advance an argument that the polemics with the exalted figure of the hero of the Flood found in *2 Enoch* might represent the response of the Enochic tradition to the challenges posed to the classic profile of the seventh antediluvian hero by the Second Temple mediatorial traditions about the exalted patriarchs and prophets.

A further and more important goal of this study will be clarification of the possible date of *2 Enoch*, which represents a crucial problem for the students of the Slavonic apocalypse who often lament the absence of unambiguous textual evidence that can place the pseudepigraphon in the chronological boundaries of Second Temple Judaism. Scholars have rightly observed that «although many commentators take for granted a date as early as the first century CE for *2 Enoch*, the fact remains that it survives only in medieval manuscripts in Slavonic and that exegesis of it needs to commence at that point and proceed backwards to a putative (and highly debatable) first-century Jewish original only on the basis of rigorous argument».[3]

It is possible that the anti-Noachic developments found in the Slavonic apocalypse can finally provide the decisive proof for the early date of this text. The investigation will explore whether Noachic polemical developments, which focus on the issues of sacrificial practices and priestly successions, can be firmly dated not later than 70 CE, since they reflect a distinctive sacer-

saw that she was pregnant. Nir, filled with shame, wanted to cast her from him, but she died at his feet. Melchisedek was born from Sothonim's corpse. When Nir and Noah came in to bury Sothonim, they saw the child sitting beside the corpse with «his clothing on him». According to the story, they were terrified because the child was fully developed physically. The child spoke with his lips and he blessed the Lord. According to the story, the newborn child was marked with the sacerdotal sign, the glorious «badge of priesthood» on his chest. Nir and Noah dressed the child in the garments of priesthood and they fed him the holy bread. They decided to hide him, fearing that the people would have him put to death. Finally, the Lord commanded His archangel Gabriel to take the child and place him in «the paradise Eden» so that he might become the high priest after the Flood. The final passages of the story describe the ascent of Melchisedek on the wings of Gabriel to the paradise Eden.

[3] J. R. Davila, Melchisedek, the «Youth», and Jesus // The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity. Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001 / Ed. J. R. Davila (Leiden, 2003) (STDJ, 46) 261, n. 20.

dotal situation peculiar to the time when the Temple was still standing. This study will try to demonstrate that the Noachic polemics in *2 Enoch* belong to the same stream of early Enochic testimonies to the priestly-Noah tradition as those reflected in the *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Epistle of Enoch*, written before the destruction of the Second Jerusalem Temple.

Purpose of the Polemics

My study published in *Henoch*[4] demonstrated that *2 Enoch* shows a systematic tendency to diminish or refocus the priestly significance of the figure of Noah. These revisions take place in the midst of the debates about sacrificial practice and priestly succession. But what is the role of this denigration of the hero of the Flood and the traditions associated with his name in the larger framework of the mediatorial polemical interactions found in the Slavonic apocalypse?

I have argued elsewhere that the anti-Noachic developments is not the only polemical trend found in the Slavonic apocalypse.[5] In fact *2 Enoch* reveals an intricate web of mediatorial debates in the course of which the several traditions about exalted patriarchs and prophets prominent in Second Temple Judaism, including Adam and Moses, underwent polemical appropriation when their exalted features are transferred to the seventh antediluvian hero. These polemical tendencies seem to reflect the familiar atmosphere of the mediatorial debates widespread in the Second Temple period which offered contending accounts for the primacy and supremacy of their exalted heroes. The polemics found in *2 Enoch* is part of these debates and represent a response of the Enochic tradition to the challenges of its rivals.

It has been mentioned that *2 Enoch* contains polemics with Adamic and Mosaic traditions. These polemical moves are consistent with the ambiguous attitude towards Adam and Moses already discernable in the earliest Enochic materials where these two exalted characters traditionally understood as the major mediatorial rivals of the seventh antediluvian patriarch.[6]

---

[4] Orlov, «Noah's Younger Brother»… 259–273.

[5] A. Orlov, On the Polemical Nature of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reply to C. Böttrich // *JSJ* 34 (2003) 274–303; idem, «Without Measure and Without Analogy»: The Tradition of the Divine Body in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch // *JJS* 56.2 (2005) 224–244.

[6] See: J. VanderKam, The Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch // The Bible at Qumran / Eds. P. W. Flint, T. H. Kim (Grand Rapids, 2000) 142; P. Alexander, From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch // Biblical Figures Outside the Bible / Ed. M. E. Stone, T. A. Bergen (Harrisburg, 1998) 100; idem, Enoch and the Beginnings of Jewish Interest in Natural Science // The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiental Thought / Ed. C. Hempel et al. (Leuven, 2002) (BETL, CLIX) 234; Orlov, On the Polemical Nature of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch… 276–277.

But why do the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse attempt to diminish the significance of Noah, who was traditionally considered as a main ally of the seventh antediluvian patriarch and, consequently, occupied a prominent place among the main heroes of the Enochic lore starting from the earliest Enochic booklets?

The important feature of the removal of Noah's priestly and sacrificial roles in *2 Enoch* is that, although the significance of the hero of the flood is almost completely sacerdotally denigrated, it does not affect or destroy the value or meaning of the alternative priestly tradition which he was faithfully representing for such a long time. The legacy of this priestly-sacrificial office is still strictly maintained within the Enochic family since Noah's priestly garments are not lost or destroyed but instead are skillfully transferred to other kinsmen of the Enochic clan, including its traditional member Methuselah[7] and two other, newly-acquired relatives, Nir[8] and Melchisedek.[9]

This shows that the impetus for the denigration of Noah, this important character of the Enochic-Noachic axis, does not come from opponents to the Enochic tradition, but rather originates within this lore. It represents a domestic conflict that attempts to downgrade and devalue the former paladin who has become so notable that his exalted status in the context of mediatorial interactions now poses an imminent threat to the main hero of the Enochic tradition. It is noteworthy that in the course of the aforementioned polemical transferences, the priestly profile of Enoch and the sacerdotal status of some members of his immediate family become much stronger. His son Methuselah, the first-born and heir of his father's teaching, has now acquired the roles of high priest and pioneer of animal sacrificial practice by constructing an altar on the high place associated with the Jerusalem Temple.[10] Further, it should not be forgotten that the priest Nir is also a member of Enoch's family, so the future priest Melchisedek, who despite the fact of his bizarre fatherless birth, is nevertheless safely brought into the circle of Enoch's family through his adoption by Nir.[11] The priestly succession from Enoch and Methuselah to Shem-Melchisedek, an important carrier of sacrificial precepts, thus occurs without the help of Noah. Moreover this enigmatic heir of Enoch's priestly tradition is then able to survive the Deluge not in the ark of the hero of the Flood, but through translation, like Enoch, to heaven.

[7] Orlov, «Noah's Younger Brother»... 209.

[8] Ibid. 210.

[9] Ibid. 216ff.

[10] *2 Enoch* 68–69. F. I. Andersen, 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 196–199.

[11] In *2 Enoch* 71 Nir says to the Lord: «For I have no descendants, so let this child take the place of my descendants and become as my own son, and you will count him in the number of your servants». Andersen, 2 Enoch... 209.

Enoch also seems to have benefited from Noah's removal from priestly and sacrificial duties since this has made him the only remaining authority in sacrificial instruction, an office that he shared previously with Noah.[12] This fact might have encouraged him to openly deliver a series of sacrificial halakhot to his children that he never did previously in the Enochic materials.[13]

It is also significant that, although the priestly profile of Noah is removed in the text and his elevated qualities are transferred to other characters, he still remains a faithful member of the Enochic clan. Although he ceases to be an extraordinary figure and peacefully surrenders his prominent offices to his relatives, he still manages to perfectly fit in the family surroundings by virtue of his newly acquired role of an average person and a family helper in the new plot offered by 2 *Enoch*'s authors.[14] This depiction of Noah as an ordinary person provides an important key for understanding the main objective of Noachic polemics in the Slavonic apocalypse as an argument against the exalted profile of the hero of the Flood posing as a mediatorial rival of Enoch.

The changing attitude toward Noah as a potential threat to Enoch's exalted role might already be detected in the late Second Temple Enochic developments. A tradition preserved in the Ethiopic text of the *Animal Apocalypse*[15] portrays Noah with imagery identical to that used in the portrayal of Moses in the Aramaic and Ethiopic versions of the text, that is, as an animal transformed into a human; in the zoomorphic code of the book this metamorphosis signifies the transformation into an angelomorphic creature. The Aramaic fragments of *1 Enoch* do not attest to the tradition of Noah's elevation, which suggests that this tradition was a later Second Temple development.[16] It might indicate that in the later Second Temple Enochic lore, about the time when *2 Enoch* was written, Noah was understood as an angelomorphic creature similar to Moses, thus posing a potential threat to the elevated profile of the seventh antediluvian hero.

Debates about the Date

The foregoing analysis of Noachic polemics in the Slavonic apocalypse points to the complex process of interaction between the various mediatorial streams competing for the primacy of their heroes. Yet these conceptual en-

[12] Orlov, «Noah's Younger Brother»… 210–212.

[13] *2 Enoch* 59. Andersen, 2 Enoch… 184–187.

[14] In *2 Enoch* 71, Noah is depicted as a timid relative whose activities are confined to the circle of his family. After Melchisedek's situation was settled, Noah quietly «went away to his own place». Andersen, 2 Enoch… 206–207.

[15] *1 Enoch* 89:9.

[16] P. Tiller, A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch (Atlanta, 1993) (EJL, 4) 267.

gagements allow us not only to gain a clearer view of the enhancement of Enoch's elevated profile but also to determine a possible date for the text.

Students of Jewish pseudepigrapha have previously raised concerns about the date of the Slavonic apocalypse, pointing to the fact that the text does not seem to supply definitive evidence for placing it within precise chronological boundaries.

It should be noted that the scholarly attitude towards the Slavonic apocalypse as evidence of Second Temple Jewish developments remains somewhat ambiguous in view of the uncertainty of the text's date. Although students of the apocalypse working closely with the text insist on the early date of the Jewish pseudepigraphon, a broader scholarly community has been somehow reluctant to fully embrace *2 Enoch* as a Second Temple Jewish text.[17] In scholarly debates about the Second Temple pseudepigrapha, one can often find references to Francis Andersen's remark that «in every respect *2 Enoch* remains an enigma. So long as the date and location remain unknown, no use can be made of it for historical purposes».[18]

The uncritical use of this brief statement about *2 Enoch* as an enigma «in every respect» unfortunately tends to oversimplify the scholarly situation and

[17] The early date of the pseudepigraphon was supported by, among others, the following investigations: R. H. Charles, W. R. Morfill, The Book of the Secrets of Enoch (Oxford, 1896); М. И. Соколов, Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий, VII: Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного / Тексты, латинский пер. и исследование. Посмертный труд автора приготовил к изд. М. Сперанский // *ЧОИДР* 4 (1910) 165; G. N. Bonwetsch, Das slavische Henochbuch (Berlin, 1896) (AGWG.PH Neue Folge Bd.1 Nr. 3); N. Schmidt, The Two Recensions of Slavonic Enoch // *JAOS* 41 (1921) 307–312; G. Scholem, Ursprung und Anfänge der Kabbala (Berlin, 1962) (SJ, 3) 62–64; M. Philonenko, La cosmogonie du «Livre des secrets d'Hénoch» // Religions en Égypte: Hellénistique et romaine (Paris, 1969) 109–116; S. Pines, Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch // Types of Redemption / Eds. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, C. Jouco Bleeker (Leiden, 1970) (SHR, 18) 72–87; J. C. Greenfield, Prolegomenon // H. Odeberg, 3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch (New York, 1973) xviii–xx; U. Fischer, Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum (Berlin, 1978) (BZNW, 44) 38–41; J. H. Charlesworth, The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch (Seminar Report) // *NTS* 25 (1979) 315–323; J. J. Collins, The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism // Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East / Ed. D. Hellholm (Tübingen—Siebeck, 1983) 533; Andersen, 2 Enoch… 91–221; M. E. Stone, Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus (Assen, 1984) (CRINT, 2.2) 406; A. de Santos Otero, Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo) // Apocrifos del AT. 4 vols. / Ed. A. Díez Macho (Madrid, 1984) 4.147–202; C. Böttrich, Das slavische Henochbuch (Gütersloh, 1995) (JSHRZ, 5) 812–813. P. Sacchi, Jewish Apocalyptic and its History (Sheffield, 1996) (JSPSS, 20).

[18] Andersen, 2 Enoch… 97.

diminish the value of the long and complex history of efforts to clarify the provenance and date the text.[19] The following brief excursus into the history of arguments against the early date of the text demonstrates the extreme rarity of critical attempts and their very limited power of persuasion.

1. In 1896, in his introduction to the English translation of *2 Enoch*, R. H. Charles assigned «with reasonable certainty» the composition of the text to the period between 1–50 CE,[20] before the destruction of the Temple; this view, however, did not remain unchallenged.[21] In 1918 the British astronomer A. S. D. Maunder launched an attack against the early dating of the pseudepigraphon, arguing that the Slavonic Enoch does not represent an early Jewish text written in the first century CE, but instead is «a specimen of Bogomil propaganda», composed in the Slavonic language in «the "Middle Bulgarian" period — i.e., between the 12th and 15th centuries».[22] In the attempt to justify her claim, Maunder appealed to the theological content of the book, specifically to its alleged Bogomil features, such as the dualism of good and evil powers. She found that such dualistic ideas were consistent with the sectarian teaching that «God had two sons, Satanail and Michael».[23] Maunder's study was not limited solely to the analysis of the theological features of the text but also included a summary of the astronomical and calendarical observations which attempted to prove a late date for the text. Her argument against the early dating of the pseudepigraphon was later supported by J. K. Fotheringham, who offered a less radical hypothesis that the date of *2 Enoch* must be no earlier than the middle of the seventh century CE.[24]

Scholars have noted that Maunder's argumentation tends to underestimate the theological and literary complexities of the Slavonic Enoch. The

[19] After all it should not be forgotten that in the same study Francis Andersen explicitly assigns the book to the late first century CE. Andersen, 2 Enoch… 91.

[20] In his introduction to the Forbes' translation of *2 Enoch* in APOT, Charles broadened the range of the dating of the apocalypse, postulating that «*2 Enoch* in its present form was written probably between 30 B.C. and A.D. 70. It was written after 30 B.C., for it makes use of *Sirach*, *1 Enoch*, and the *Book of Wisdom*..., and before A.D. 70; for the temple is still standing». R. H. Charles, N. Forbes, The Book of the Secrets of Enoch // APOT. Vol. 2. 429. This opinion about the early date of *2 Enoch* was also supported by Charles' contemporaries, the Russian philologist Matvej Sokolov and German theologian Nathaniel Bonwetsch. Соколов, Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного…; Bonwetsch, Das slavische Henochbuch…; idem, Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs…

[21] R. H. Charles, W. R. Morfill, The Book of the Secrets of Enoch (Oxford, 1896) xxvi.

[22] A. S. D. Maunder, The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch // *The Observatory* 41 (1918) 309–316, esp. 316.

[23] Ibid. 315.

[24] J. K. Fotheringham, The Date and the Place of Writing of the Slavonic Enoch // *JTS* 20 (1919) 252.

remark was made that, after reading Maunder's article, one can be «astonished at the weakness of this argument and at the irrelevant matters adduced in support of it».[25] Charles responded to the criticism of Maunder and Fortheringam in his article published in 1921 in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, in which he pointed out, among other things, that «the Slavonic Enoch, which ascribes the entire creation to God and quotes the Law as divine, could not have emanated from the Bogomils».[26]

2. Another attempt to question the scholarly consensus about the early date of *2 Enoch* was made by Josef Milik in his introduction to the edition of the Qumran fragments of the Enochic books published in 1976.[27] In the introductory section devoted to the Slavonic Enoch, Milik proposed that the apocalypse was composed between the ninth and tenth centuries CE by a Byzantine Christian monk who knew the Enochic Pentateuch «in the form with which we are familiar through the Ethiopic version».[28] In order to support his hypothesis of a late date Milik draws attention to several lexical features of the text. One of them is the Slavonic word **змоуренiемь** (*zmureniem'*)[29] found in *2 Enoch* 22:11 which Milik has traced to the Greek term συρμαιόγραφος,[30] a derivative of the verb συρμαιογραφεῖν, translated as «to write in minuscule, hence quickly».[31] He argues that this verb appears to be a neologism which is not attested in any Greek text before the beginning of the ninth century. In addition in his analysis of the lexical features of the apocalypse, Milik directed attention to the angelic names of Arioch and Marioch found in *2 Enoch* 33, arguing that they represent the equivalents of the Harut and Marut of the Muslim legends attested in the second sura of the Qur'an.[32]

John Collins, among others, has offered criticism of Milik's lexical arguments, noting that even if the Slavonic text uses the Greek word συρμαιόγρα-

[25] A. Rubinstein, Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch // *JJS* 15 (1962) 1–21, esp. 3.

[26] R. H. Charles, The Date and Place of Writings of the Slavonic Enoch // *JTS* 22 (1921) 162–163. See also K. Lake, The Date of the Slavonic Enoch // *HTR* 16 (1923) 397–398.

[27] J. T. Milik, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4 (Oxford, 1976).

[28] Ibid. 109.

[29] Соколов, Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного… 1.23, footnote 13.

[30] Milik's hypothesis is implausible. Most scholars trace the word **змоуренiемь** (*zmureniem'*) to the Slavonic **змоурьна** (*zmur'na*) which corresponds to σμύρνα, *myrrha*. J. Kurz (ed.), Slovnik Jazyka Staroslovenskeho (Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae). 4 vols. (Prague, 1966ff) Vol. 1. 677–678. Andersen's translation renders the relevant part of *2 Enoch* 22:11 as follows: «And Vereveil hurried and brought me the books mottled with myrrh». Andersen, 2 Enoch… 141.

[31] Milik, The Books of Enoch… 111.

[32] Ibid. 110.

ϕος, «a single word in the translation is not an adequate basis for dating the whole work».[33] He has also pointed out that «the alleged correspondence of the angels Arioch and Marioch to Harut and Marut of Muslim legend is indecisive since the origin of these figures has not been established».[34]

Milik's arguments were not confined only to the lexical features of the apocalypse. He also argued that the priestly succession from Methuselah to Noah's nephew Melchisedek described in the third part of *2 Enoch* reflects «the transmission of monastic vocations from uncle to nephew, the very widespread custom in the Greek Church during the Byzantine and medieval periods».[35] This feature in his opinion also points to the late Byzantine date of the pseudepigraphon. Unfortunately Milik was unaware of the polemical nature of the priestly successions detailed in the Slavonic Enoch and did not understand the actual role of Nir and Melchisedek in the polemical exposition of the story.

It should be noted that Milik's insistence on the Byzantine Christian provenance of the Slavonic apocalypse was partially inspired by the earlier research of the French Slavist André Vaillant who argued for the Christian authorship of the text.[36] Vaillant's position too generated substantial critical response since the vast majority of readers of *2 Enoch* had been arguing for the Jewish provenance of the original core of the text.[37]

The foregoing analysis of the arguments against the early dating of the pseudepigraphon demonstrates how scanty and unsubstantiated they were in the sea of the overwhelming positive consensus. It also shows that none of these hypotheses has been able to stand up to criticism and to form a rationale that would constitute a viable counterpart to the scholarly opinion supporting the early date. Still, one should recognize that, while the adoption of an early date for the text itself does not face great challenges, placing the text within the precise boundaries of Second Temple Judaism is a much more difficult task.

In proceeding to this task one must first understand what features of the text point to the early date of the text in the chronological framework of

[33] J. J. Collins, The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism // Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East / Ed. D. Hellholm (Tübingen, 1983) 533, n. 7.

[34] Ibid. 533, note 7.

[35] Milik, The Books of Enoch… 114.

[36] A. Vaillant, Le Livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française (Paris, 1976 [1952]) (Textes publiés par l'Institut d'études slaves, 4).

[37] Some of the supporters of the idea of the Jewish authorship of the text include the following scholars: Amusin, Andersen, Bonwetsch, Böttrich, Bousset, Charles, Charlesworth, Collins, De Conick, Delcor, Denis, Eissfeldt, Ginzberg, Gieschen, Greenfield, Gruenwald, Fletcher-Louis, Fossum, Harnak, Himmelfarb, Kahana, Kamlah, Mach, Meshcherskij, Odeberg, Pines, Philonenko, Riessler, Sacchi, Segal, Sokolov, de Santos Otero, Schmidt, Scholem, Schürer, Stichel, Stone, and Székeley.

Second Temple Judaism. It is noteworthy that the vast majority of scholarly efforts have been in this respect directed towards finding possible hints that might somehow indicate that the Temple was still standing when the original text was composed.[38] Thus, scholars have previously noted that the text does not seem to hint that the catastrophe of the destruction of the Temple has already occurred at the time of its composition. Critical readers of the pseudepigraphon would have some difficulties finding any explicit expression of feelings of sadness or mourning about the loss of the sanctuary.

The affirmations of the value of the animal sacrificial practices and Enoch's halakhic instructions also appear to be fashioned not in the «preservationist», mishnaic-like mode of expression, but rather as if they reflected sacrificial practices that still existed when the author was writing his book.[39] There is also an intensive and consistent effort on the part of the author to legitimize the central place of worship, which through the reference to the place *Achuzan* (a cryptic name for the temple mountain in Jerusalem), is transparently connected in *2 Enoch* with the Jerusalem Temple.[40] Scholars have also previously noted that there are some indications in the text of the ongoing practice of pilgrimage to the central place of worship; these indications could be expected in a text written in the Alexandrian Diaspora.[41] Thus, in his instructions to the children, Enoch repeatedly encourages them to bring the gifts before the face of God for the remission of sins, a practice which appears to recall well-known sacrificial customs widespread in the Second Temple period.[42] Moreover, the Slavonic apocalypse also contains a direct command to visit the Temple three times a day, advice that would be difficult to fulfill if the sanctuary has already been destroyed.[43]

One can see that the crucial arguments for the early dating of the text are all linked to the themes of the Sanctuary and its ongoing practices and customs. These discussions are not new; even Charles employed the references to the Temple practices found in the Slavonic apocalypse as main proofs for his hypothesis of the early date of the apocalypse. Since Charles' pioneering research these arguments have been routinely reiterated by scholars.

---

[38] U. Fischer, Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum (Berlin, 1978) (BZNW, 44) 40–41; Böttrich, Das slavische Henochbuch… 812–813.

[39] *2 Enoch* 59.

[40] In Ezek 48:20–21 the Hebrew word אחוזה «special property of God» is applied to Jerusalem and the Temple. Milik, The Books of Enoch… 114.

[41] Böttrich, Das slavische Henochbuch… 813.

[42] *2 Enoch* 61:1–5; *2 Enoch* 62:1–2.

[43] *2 Enoch* 51:4: «In the morning of the day and in the middle of the day and in the evening of the day it is good to go to the Lord's temple on account of the glory of your creator». Andersen, 2 Enoch… 178.

Recently, however, Christfried Böttrich attempted to broaden the familiar range of argumentation by bringing to scholarly attention a description of the joyful celebration which in his opinion may fix the date of the apocalypse within the boundaries of the Second Temple period. In his introduction to his German translation of *2 Enoch* published in 1995, Böttrich draws attention to a tradition found in Chapter 69 of the Slavonic apocalypse which deals with the joyful festival marking Methuselah's priestly appointment and his animal sacrifices.[44] According to Böttrich's calculations, this cult-establishing event falls on the 17th of Tammuz, which in his opinion is identified in *2 Enoch* as the day of the summer solstice.[45] Böttrich links this solar event with the imagery found in *2 Enoch* 69, where Methuselah's face becomes radiant in front of the altar «like the sun at midday rising up». He then reminds us that, since the second century CE, the 17th of Tammuz was observed as a day of mourning and fasting because it was regarded as the day when Titus conquered Jerusalem.[46] Böttrich suggests that the description of the joyful festival in *2 Enoch* 69, which does not show any signs of sadness or mourning, indicates that the account and consequently the whole book were written before the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE.[47]

Böttrich's observations are of interest, but his understanding of Chapter 69 and especially of the motif of the radiant face of Methuselah, pivotal for his argument, is problematic in light of the polemical developments detected in the Slavonic apocalypse. Böttrich is unaware of the Noachic polemics witnessed to by the Slavonic apocalypse and does not notice that the description of Methuselah as the originator of the animal sacrificial cult in *2 Enoch* 69 represents the polemical counterpart to Noah's role, who is portrayed in the Bible and the pseudepigrapha as the pioneer of animal sacrificial practice.[48] Methuselah, who has never been previously attested in Second Temple materials as the originator of sacrificial cult, thus openly supplants Noah, whose prominent role and elevated status the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse want to diminish. It has already been mentioned that in the course of the Noachic polemics, many exalted features of the hero of the Flood have been transferred to other characters of the book. One of these transferences includes the motif of the luminous face of Noah, the feature which the hero of the flood acquired at his birth.

---

[44] Böttrich, Das slavische Henochbuch… 813. See also: C. Böttrich, The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reaction to A. Orlov // *JSJ* 32.4 (2001) 451.

[45] There are many discrepancies and contradictions in the calendarical data presented in the text.

[46] *y.* Ta'an. 68c and *b.* Ta'an. 26b.

[47] Böttrich, Das slavische Henochbuch… 813.

[48] M. Stone, The Axis of History at Qumran // Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls / Eds. E. Chazon, M. E. Stone (Leiden, 1999) (STDJ, 31) 138.

As one might recall, the early Enochic materials portray Noah as a wonder child. *1 Enoch* 106,[49] the *Genesis Apocryphon*,[50] and possibly 1Q19[51] depict him with a glorious face and eyes «like the rays of the sun». *1 Enoch* 106:2 relates that when the new-born Noah opened his eyes, the whole house lit up. The child then opened his mouth and blessed the Lord of heaven. Scholars have previously noted[52] that the scene of the glorious visage of the young hero of the Flood delivering blessings upon his rising up from the hands of the midwife has a sacerdotal significance and parallels the glorious appearance and actions of the high priest.[53] It manifests the portentous beginning of the priestly-Noah tradition.[54] The priestly features of Noah's natal account are important for discerning the proper meaning of the symbolism of Methuselah's luminous visage in *2 Enoch* 69.

In his analysis of the account, C. Böttrich recognizes that the description of Methuselah's radiant face alludes to the picture of the high priest Simon attested in Sirach 50:1–24. Still, Böttrich is unable to discern the Noachic meaning of this allusion. Meanwhile Fletcher-Louis clearly sees this Noachic link, demonstrating that Methuselah's radiant face in *2 Enoch* 69 is linked not only to Sirach 50:5–11 but also to *1 Enoch* 106:2[55] and

[49] *1 Enoch* 106:5 «...his eyes (are) like the rays of the sun, and his face glorious...». M. Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments. 2 vols (Oxford, 1978) Vol. 2. 244–245.

[50] 1QapGen 5:12–13 «...his face has been lifted to me and his eyes shine like [the] s[un...] (of) this boy is flame and he...» F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar (eds.), The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition. 2 vols (Leiden—New York—Köln, 1997) 1.31.

[51] A similar tradition is reflected in 1Q19. 1Q19 3: «...were aston[ished ...] [... (not like the children of men) the fir]st-born is born, but the glorious ones [...] [...] his father, and when Lamech saw [...] [...] the chambers of the house like the beams of the sun [...] to frighten the [...]». 1Q19 13»:[...] because the glory of your face [...] for the glory of God in [...] [... he will] be exalted in the splendor of the glory and the beauty [...] he will be honored in the midst of [...]». García Martínez, Tigchelaar, The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition... Vol. 1. 27.

[52] C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls (Leiden, 2002) (STDJ, 42) 33ff.

[53] Crispin Fletcher-Louis notes parallels between this scene and the description of the ideal high priest from Sirach 50. He argues that «in Sirach 50 the liturgical procession through Simon's various ministrations climaxes with Aaron's blessings of the people (50:20, cf. Numbers 6) and a call for all the readers of Sirach's work "to bless the God of all who everywhere works greater wonders, who fosters our growth from birth and deals with us according to his mercy" (50:22). So, too, in 1 Enoch 106:3 the infant Noah rises from the hands of the midwife and, already able to speak as an adult, "he opened his mouth and blessed the Lord"». Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory of Adam... 47.

[54] Fletcher-Louis argues that «the staging for [Noah's] birth and the behavior of the child have strongly priestly resonances». Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory of Adam... 46.

[55] Ibid. 50.

1Q19.[56] Sirach's description of the high priest Simon serves here as an intermediate link that elucidates the connection between Noah and Methuselah. All three characters are sharing the identical priestly imagery. Fletcher-Louis notes strong parallelism between Simon's description and the priestly features of the story of Noah. He observes that

> this description of Simon the high priest comes at the climax of a lengthy hymn in praise of Israel's heroes which had begun some six chapters earlier with (Enoch and) Noah (44:16–17), characters whose identity and purpose in salvation-history the high priest gathers up in his cultic office. Obviously, at the literal level Noah's birth in *1 Enoch* 106:2 takes place in the *private* house of his parents. However, I suggest the reader is meant to hear a deeper symbolic reference in that house to *the* house (cf. Sirach 50:1), the Temple, which Simon the high priest illuminates and glorifies. Just as Simon appears from behind the veil which marks the transition from heaven to earth and brings a numinous radiance to the realm of creation at worship, so Noah breaks forth from his mother's waters to illuminate the house of his birth.[57]

It has been mentioned that Böttrich points to the possible connection of the radiance of Methuselah's face to solar symbolism. Nevertheless, he fails to discern the proper meaning of such a connection, unable to recognize the Noachic background of the imagery. It is not coincidental that in the Noachic accounts the facial features of the hero of the Flood are linked to solar imagery. Fletcher-Louis notes the prominence of the solar symbolism in the description of Noah's countenance; his eyes are compared with «the rays of the sun». He suggests that «the solar imagery might ultimately derive from the Mesopotamian primeval history where the antediluvian hero is closely identified with the sun».[58] Yet in the Second Temple period such solar imagery has taken on distinctively priestly associations.[59]

In light of the aforementioned traditions, it is clear that Methuselah, who in *2 Enoch* 69 inherits Noah's priestly office is also assuming there the features of his appearance as a high priest, one of which is the radiant visage associated with solar symbolism. The radiant face of Methuselah in *2 Enoch* 69 thus represents a significant element of the polemics against the priestly Noachic tradition and its main character, whose facial features were often compared to the radiance of the sun.

---

[56] He notes that the statement «I shall glorify you in front of the face of all the people, and you will be glorified all the days of your life» (*2 Enoch* 69:5) and the references to God «raising up» a priest for himself in 69:2,4 «is intriguingly reminiscent of 1Q19 13 lines 2–3». Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory of Adam… 50.

[57] Ibid. 47.

[58] Ibid. 46.

[59] Ibid. 46.

Noachic Polemics and the Date of the Text

The analysis of the Noachic background of the priestly and sacrificial practices in *2 Enoch* leads us to the important question about the role of Noachic polemical developments in discerning the early date of the apocalypse. It is possible that the Noachic priestly polemics reflected in *2 Enoch* represent the most important and reliable testimony that the text was composed when the Second Temple was still standing.

The central evidence here is the priestly features of the miraculous birth of the hero. It has been already demonstrated that the main concern of the story of the wondrous birth was sacerdotal; the story is permeated with imagery portraying the newborn as the high priest *par excellence*. It also has been shown that the anti-Noachic priestly tradition reflected in *2 Enoch* is not separate from the Enochic-Noachic axis but belongs to the same set of conceptual developments reflected in such Second Temple Enochic and Noachic materials as *1 Enoch* 106, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, and 1Q19.[60] The traditions prevalent in these accounts were reworked by the Enochic author(s) of the Slavonic apocalypse in response to the new challenging circumstances of the mediatorial polemics. The priestly features of *2 Enoch's* account of the wondrous birth might thus point to the fact that this narrative and, as a consequence, the whole macroform to which it belongs was written in the Second Temple period. It should be emphasized again that the distinct chronological marker here is not the story of the wonder child itself, which was often imitated in later Jewish materials, but the priestly features of the story that are missing in these later improvisations.

The analysis of the later pseudepigraphic and rabbinic imitations of the account of Noah's birth shows that the priestly dimension of the story never transcended the boundaries of the Enochic-Noachic lore, nor did it cross the chronological boundary of 70 CE since it remained relevant only within the sacerdotal context of the Second Temple Enochic-Noachic materials. Although some later Jewish authors were familiar with the account of Noah's birth, this story never again became the subject of priestly polemics once the dust of the destroyed Temple settled.

Several examples can illustrate this situation. In search of the later variants of the story of the wonder-child Fletcher-Louis draws attention to the account of Cain's birth in the primary Adam books.[61] Thus, the Latin *Life of Adam and Eve* 21:3 relates that Eve «brought forth a son who shone brilliantly (*lucidus*). At once the infant stood up and ran out and brought some grass

[60] Fletcher-Louis suggests that the authors of *Jubilees* probably also knew the story of Noah's birth, since the text mentions his mother Bitenosh. Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory of Adam… 35, n. 9.

[61] Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory of Adam… 51–52.

with his own hands and gave it to his mother. His name was called Cain».[62] Fletcher-Louis points out that this narrative of the wonder child recalls the story of Noah. Yet he notes that «all the features which in the birth of Noah signal the child's priestly identity — solar imagery, birth in a house and child's blessing of God are markedly absent in the Adamic story».[63] Such absence of the significant features can be an indication that the final form of the text was composed outside the chronological boundaries of Second Temple Judaism and therefore, unlike *2 Enoch*, displays no interest in the sacerdotal dimension of the story. Although the authors of the Latin *LAE* might have been familiar with the narrative of Noah's birth, the priestly concerns associated with the story were no longer relevant for them.

The same situation of the absence of the sacerdotal concern is observable also in the rabbinic stories of Moses' birth reflected in *b.* Sotah 12a,[64] *Exod. R.* 1:20,[65] *Deut. R.* 11:10,[66] *PRE* 48,[67] and the *Zohar* II.11b,[68] whose authors were possibly cognizant of the Noachic natal account.

---

[62] G. A. Anderson, M. E. Stone, A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve. Second Revised Edition (Atlanta, 1999) (SBLEJL, 17) 24–24E. See also Armenian and Georgian versions of LAE: «Then, when she bore the child, the color of his body was like the color of stars. At the hour when the child fell into the hands of the midwife, he leaped up and, with his hands, plucked up the grass of the earth...» (Armenian). «Eve arose as the angel had instructed her: she gave birth to an infant and his color was like that of the stars. He fell into the hands of the midwife and (at once) he began to pluck up the grass...». (Georgian). A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve... 24E.

[63] Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory of Adam... 52.

[64] «He was born circumcised; and the Sages declare, At the time when Moses was born, the whole house was filled with light — as it is written here, "And she saw him that he was good" (Ex 2:2) and elsewhere it is written, "And God saw the light that it was good" (Gen 1:4)». *b.* Sotah 12a.

[65] «...she saw that the Shechinah was with him; that is, the 'it' refers to the Shechinah which was with the child». Midrash Rabbah / Trs. H. Freedman, M. Simon. 10 vols. (London, 1961) Vol. 3. 29–30.

[66] «Moses replied: "I am the son of Amram, and came out from my mother's womb without prepuce, and had no need to be circumcised; and on the very day on which I was born I found myself able to speak and was able to walk and to converse with my father and mother ... when I was three months old I prophesied and declared that I was destined to receive the law from the midst of flames of fire"». Midrash Rabbah... Vol 7. 185.

[67] «Rabbi Nathaniel said: the parents of Moses saw the child, for his form was like that of an angel of God. They circumcised him on the eight day and they called his name Jekuthiel». Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer / Tr. G. Friedländer (New York, 1965^2) 378.

[68] «She saw the light of the Shekinah playing around him: for when he was born this light filled the whole house, the word "good" here having the same reference as in the verse "and God saw the light that it was good" (Gen 1:4)». The Zohar / Trs.

Reflecting on this evidence Fletcher-Louis notices that, although the authors of the rabbinic accounts of Moses' birth appear to be familiar with Noah's narrative, these materials do not show any interest in the sacerdotal dimension of the original story. Buried in the ashes of the destroyed Sanctuary, the alternative portrayal of the Noachic priestly tradition was neither offensive nor challenging for the heirs of the Pharisaic tradition. Fletcher-Louis observes that, although Moses, like Noah, is able to speak from his birth and the house of his birth becomes flooded with light, «the differences of the specifically priestly form of that older tradition can be clearly seen».[69] He points out that while Moses is able to speak as soon as he is born, he does not bless God, as do Noah and Melchisedek.[70] The same paradigm shift is detected in the light symbolism. While in the rabbinic stories the whole house becomes flooded with light, the Mosaic birth texts do not specifically say that Moses is himself the source of light.[71] These differences indicate that, unlike in *2 Enoch*, where the priestly concerns of the editors come to the fore, in the rabbinic accounts they have completely evaporated.[72] Fletcher-Louis notices that «the fact that in the Mosaic stories the child is circumcised at birth indicates his role as an idealized representative of every Israelite: where Noah bears the marks of the priesthood, Moses carries the principal identity marker of every member of Israel, irrespective of any distinction between laity and priesthood».[73]

The marked absence of sacerdotal concerns in the later imitations of the story may explain why, although the rabbinic authors knew of the priestly affiliations of the hero of the Flood, the story of his priestly birth never appeared in the debates about the priestly successions. This fact convincingly demonstrates that the Noachic priestly tradition reflected in *2 Enoch* can be firmly placed inside the chronological boundaries of the Second Temple period, which allows us to safely assume a date of the Melchisedek story and the entire apocalypse before 70 CE.

H. Sperling, M. Simon. 5 vols. (London—New York, 1933) Vol. 3. 35. See also Samaritan *Molad Mosheh*: «She became pregnant with Moses and was great with child, and the light was present». Samaritan Documents Relating to Their History, Religion and Life / Tr. J. Bowman (Pittsburgh, 1977) 287.

[69] Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory of Adam… 52.

[70] Ibid. 52.

[71] Fletcher-Louis reminds that «the illumination of the house through Noah's eyes and the comparison of the light to that of the sun are specifically priestly features of Noah's birth». Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory of Adam… 52–53.

[72] Although the priestly affiliation of the hero of the Flood was well known to the rabbinic authors, as the story of Shem-Melchisedek has already demonstrated.

[73] Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory of Adam… 53.

ABSTRACT

The paper investigates the anti-Noachic tendencies in *2 Enoch*. The analysis shows that anti-Noachic polemics in *2 Enoch* are based on the «original» Noachic materials which demonstrate close parallels with the fragments of the Book of Noah found in *1 Enoch, Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*. The anti-Noachic debates involve a substantial rewriting of the «original» Noachic motifs and themes. The research shows that *2 Enoch* contains a systematic tendency to diminish or refocus the priestly significance of the Noachic tradition. These anti-Noachic revisions take place in the midst of the sectarian debates about the sacrificial practice and the priestly succession.

Andrei A. Orlov
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

THE FLOODED ARBORETUMS: THE GARDEN TRADITIONS IN THE SLAVONIC VERSION OF *3 BARUCH* AND THE *BOOK OF GIANTS*

Introduction

The apocalypse known as *3 Baruch* depicts a celestial tour during which an angelic guide leads a visionary through five heavens revealing to him the wonders of the upper realm. Scholars have noted that some details of this heavenly journey resonate with the visionary accounts found in Enochic materials.[1] Despite the similarities, the author of *3 Baruch* seems to avoid making direct references to the motifs and themes associated with Enochic tradition. In the regard, Richard Bauckham comments: «It is remarkable that *3 Baruch*, which throughout chapters 2–5 is preoccupied with the stories of Gen 2–11, makes no reference to the Watchers».[2] He suggests, further, that the author of this apocalypse «is perhaps engaged in a polemical rejection of the Enoch traditions, so that as well as substituting Baruch for Enoch he also substitutes the human builders for the angelic Watchers. Instead of deriving evil on earth from the fall of the Watchers, he emphasizes its origin in the Garden of Eden».[3] In response to this observation, Martha Himmelfarb agrees that various textual features of *3 Baruch* reveal a polemic against the Enochic literature.[4] These observations are intriguing and deserve further investiga-

I am indebted to Professor Francis Andersen for his insight and encouragement in convincing me to undertake this study. My research was inspired by his illuminating remarks on the connection between *3 Baruch* and the Enochic traditions.

[1] F. I. Andersen, The Sun in 2 Enoch. Book of the Secrets of Enoch // *XB* 4 (X) (2002 [2006]) 380–412; R. Bauckham, The Fate of the Dead. Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses (Leiden—Boston—Cologne, 1998) (NovTSup, 93); H. E. Gaylord, 3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch // OTP. Vol. 1. 653–679; М. И. Соколов, Феникс в апокрифах об Енохе и Варухе // Новый сборник статей по славяноведению, составленный и изданный учениками В. И. Ламанского (С.-Петербург, 1905) 395–405.

[2] R. Bauckham, Early Jewish Visions of Hell // *JTS* 41 (1990) 355–385, esp. 372.

[3] Ibid. 372.

[4] M. Himmelfarb, Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses (Oxford, 1993) 93.

tion. Even a brief look at the apocalypse shows that despite a conspicuous coloring of the Adamic interpretation of the origin of evil, the details of *3 Baruch*'s descriptions of the garden expose the motifs and themes linked to another prominent story in which the source of evil is traced to the myth of the Watchers/Giants.

This study will investigate the account of paradise found in *3 Baruch* 4 and its possible connection with Enochic and Noachic traditions.

I. The Paradise Traditions of the Slavonic Version of *3 Baruch*

Third Baruch became first known in its Slavonic version[5] and only later were the Greek manuscripts of the book uncovered.[6] Despite the availability

[5] For publications of the Slavonic MSS of *3 Baruch,* see E. Hercigonja, «Videnie Varuhovo» u Petrisovu Zborniku iz 1468 godine // *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 7 (1964) 63–93; H. E. Gaylord, Slavjanskij tekst tret'ej knigi Varuha // *Polata knigopisnaja* 7 (1983) 49–56; J. Ivanov, Bogomilski knigi i legendi (Sofija, 1925) 193–200; П. А. Лавров, Откровение Варуха // *СОРЯС* 67/3 (1899) 149–151; S. Novakovic, Otkrivene Varuhovo // *Starine* 18 (1886) 203–209; М. И. Соколов, Апокрифическое откровение Варуха // *Древности. Труды Славянской Комиссии Московского Археологического Общества* 4.2 (1907) 201–258; Н. Тихонравов, Откровение Варуха // Апокрифические сказания: *СОРЯС* 58 (1894) 48–54. For translations of the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch,* see G. N. Bonwetsch, Das slavisch erhaltene Baruchbuch // *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen: Philologisch-historische Klasse* (1896) 91–101; W. Hage, Die griechische Baruch-Apokalypse // Apokalypsen / Ed. W. Hage, K.-G. Eckart, *et al.* (Gütersloh, 1974) (JSHRZ, 5/1) 15–44; Gaylord, 3 Baruch… 653–655; А. Г. Кузьмин, А. Ю. Карпов, Златоструй. Древняя Русь X–XIII вв. (Москва, 1990) 276–282; W. R. Morfill, The Apocalypse of Baruch translated from the Slavonic // Apocrypha Anecdota II / Ed. J. A. Robinson (Cambridge, 1897) (Texts, 5/1) 95–102. For research on the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch,* see: H. E. Gaylord, How Sataniel Lost His '-el,' // *JJS* 33 (1982) 303–309; idem, Redactional Elements behind the Petrisov Zbornik of III Baruch // *Slovo* 37 (1987) 91–115; idem, The Slavonic Version of III Baruch (Ph. D. diss., Jerusalem, 1983); W. Lüdtke, Beiträge zu slavischen Apocryphen: 2. Apokalypse des Baruch // *ZAW* 31 (1911) 218–231; А. Ю. Карпов, О календаре славянской книги «Откровение Варуха» // *Палестинский Сборник* 32 (1993) 81–83; П. А. Лавров, Заметка об апокрифах в рукописи Публичной библиотеки *Греч. 70* // *Juzhnoslovenski Filolog* 2 (1921) 61–64; B. Philonenko-Sayar, La version slave de l'Apocalypse de Baruch // La littérature intertestamentaire: Colloque de Strasbourg, 17–19 octobre 1983 (Paris, 1985) (Bibliothèque des centres d'études supérieures spécialisés: Travaux du Centre d'études supérieures spécialisés d'histoire des religions de Strasbourg) 89–97; Соколов, Феникс в апокрифах об Енохе и Варухе… 395–405; idem, О фениксе по апокрифическим книгам Еноха и

[6] J.-C. Picard, Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece (Leiden, 1967) (PVTG, 2).

of the Greek evidence, scholars noted that in some parts of the pseudepigraphon the Slavonic text seems to preserve more original material. H. E. Gaylord's newly assembled Slavonic sources show several areas where Slavonic appears to be closer to the original.[7] One of such areas concerns the fourth chapter of the text. Gaylord observes that the overall structure and content of chap. 4 in Slavonic seem closer to the original[8] than the extant Greek version, which in this part «has suffered the most at the hands of Christian scribes».[9] Chapter 4 of the Slavonic version contains several important details that are missing from the Greek version, including the story of the angels planting the garden. Our investigation of chap. 4 will deal with the Slavonic version and will be supplemented by the Greek version.

In *3 Baruch 4* the reader finds Baruch in the middle of his heavenly journey. The angelic guide continues to show him celestial wonders. In the beginning of the chapter, Baruch sees a serpent on a stone mountain who «eats earth like grass». Then, in 4:6, Baruch asks his *angelus interpres* to show him the tree that deceived Adam. In response to this request, Baruch hears the story about the planting and destruction of the heavenly garden. In the Slavonic version, the story has the following form:

> And the angel said to me «When God made the garden and commanded Michael to gather *two hundred* thousand[10] and three angels so that they could plant the garden, Michael planted the olive and Gabriel, the apple;

Варуха // *Древности. Труды славянской комиссии императорского Московского археологического общества* 4/1 (1907); R. Stichel, Die Verführung der Stammeltern durch Satanael nach der Kurzfassung der slavischen Baruch-Apocalypse // Kulturelle Traditionen in Bulgarien / Ed. R. Lauer, P. Schreiner (Göttingen, 1989) (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse 3/177) 116–128; É. Turdeanu, Apocryphes bogomiles et apocryphes pseudo-bogomiles // *RHR* 69 (1950) 22–52, 176–218; idem, L'Apocalypse de Baruch en slave // *Revue des études slaves* 48 (1969) 23–48; idem, Les apocryphes slaves et roumains: Leur apport à la connaissance des apocryphes grecs // *Studi bizantini e neoellenici* 8 (1953) 47–52; Б. М. Загребин, О происхождении и судьбе некоторых славянских палимпсестов Синая // Из истории рукописных и старопечатных собраний Отдела рукописей и редких книг ГПБ (Исследования, обзоры, публикации). Сборник научных трудов (Ленинград, 1979) 61–80.

[7] Gaylord, 3 Baruch… 655.

[8] In his recent research D. Harlow, The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch) in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christiantity (Leiden—New York—Cologne, 1996) (SVTP, 12) 40, supports this position, observing that «in some instances the Slavonic likely does possess an equal or better claim to priority than does the Greek, as is the case in chapters 4–5». See also his comment on p. 150: «certainly the Slavonic presents a more coherent form of material in chapters 4–5».

[9] Gaylord, 3 Baruch… 657.

[10] Some MSS read «two thousand». See Gaylord, Slavjanskij Tekst… 52.

Uriel,[11] the nut; Raphael, the melon; and Sataniel,[12] the vine. For at first his name in former times was Sataniel, and similarly all the angels planted the various trees».[13] And again I Baruch said to the angel, «Lord, show me the tree through which the serpent deceived Eve and Adam». And the angel said to me, «Listen, Baruch. In the first place, the tree was the vine, but secondly, the tree (is) sinful desire which Sataniel spread over Eve and Adam, and because of this God has cursed the vine because Sataniel had planted it, and by that he deceived the protoplast Adam and Eve». And I Baruch said to the angel, «Lord, if God has cursed the vine and its seed, then how can it be of use now?» And the angel said to me, «Rightly you ask me. When God made the Flood upon the earth, he drowned every firstling, and he destroyed 104 thousand giants, and the water rose above the highest mountains 20 cubits above the mountains, and the water entered into the garden, (*and destroyed all flower*),[14] bringing out one shoot from the

[11] Slav. **оуриль** (Gaylord, Slavjanskij Tekst… 52); Slav. **Сарасаиль** (Ivanov, Bogomilski knigi i legendi… 196). Variants of this angel's name in the Slavonic MSS of *3 Baruch* show that the author/editor knew the Enochic variations involving the names Uriel, Phanuel, and Sariel.

[12] Slav. **Сатанаиль/Сотонаиль** (Gaylord, Slavjanskij Tekst… 52; Тихонравов, Откровение Варуха… 48–54). Both Greek manuscripts read Σαμουηλ (Picard, Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece… 85).

[13] After this verse, several Slavonic MSS of the Russian group contain the following tradition: «And he said to Michael, "Sound the trumpet for the angels to assemble and bow down to the work of my hands which I made". And the angel Michael sounded the trumpet, and all the angels assembled, and all bowed down to Adam order by order. But Sataniel did not bow down and said, "To mud and dirt I will never bow down". And he said, "I will establish my throne above the clouds and I will be like the highest". Because of that, God cast him and his angels from his face just as the prophet said, "These withdrew from his face, all who hate God and the glory of God". And God commanded an angel to guard Paradise. And they ascended in order to bow down to God. Then having gone, Sataniel found the serpent and he made himself into a worm. And he said to the serpent, "Open (your mouth), consume me into your belly". And he went through the fence into Paradise, wanting to deceive Eve. But because of that one I was cast out from the glory of God. And the serpent ate him and went into Paradise and found Eve and said, "What did God command you to eat from the food of Paradise?" And Eve said, "From every tree of Paradise we eat; from this tree God commanded us not to eat". And having heard Sataniel said to her, "God begrudged the way you live lest you be immortal; take and eat and you will see and give it to Adam". And both ate and the eyes of both were opened and they saw that they were naked». (Gaylord, How Sataniel lost his '-el'… 305). For the Slavonic text, see Тихонравов, Откровение Варуха… 50.

[14] Slav. **и възатъ вьсь цвѣтъ** (Gaylord, Slavjanskij Tekst… 52). This expression can also be translated as «and took all that was blooming…». This sentence about the destruction of all vegetation in the garden is not included in Gaylord's English translation of the Slavonic version, published in OTP. The reading, however,

> vine as God withdrew the waters. And there was dry land, and Noah went out from the ark and found the vine lying on the ground, and did not recognize it having only heard about it and its form. He thought to himself, saying, «This is truly the vine which Sataniel planted in the middle of the garden, by which he deceived Eve and Adam; because of this God cursed it and its seed. So if I plant it, then will God not be angry with me?» And he knelt down on (his) knees and fasted 40 days. Praying and crying, he said, «Lord, if I plant this, what will happened?» And the Lord sent the angel Sarasael; he declared to him, «Rise, Noah, and plant the vine, and alter its name, and change it for the better» (*3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7–15).[15]

The depiction conveys several rare traditions about the garden, of which two are especially important for this investigation: the angels planting the garden and the flooding of this garden by the waters of the Deluge. Both of these traditions are preserved only in this pseudepigraphon. There are, however, some early materials that seem to allude to the same rare traditions about the garden's planting and flooding. One of these sources includes the fragments of the *Book of Giants*.

II. The Garden Traditions in the *Book of Giants*

The composition known as the *Book of Giants* exists only in a very fragmentary form preserved in Jewish and Manichean sources, including the Aramaic fragments of the *Book of Giants* found at Qumran,[16] the fragments of

---

can be found in Gaylord's publication of the Slavonic text of *3 Baruch* in «Slavjanskij tekst», 52. See also Тихонравов, Откровение Варуха… 51.

[15] Trans. Gaylord, 3 Baruch… 666. Here and later I used Gaylord's English translation of the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch* and follow his division of chapters and verses. The Slavonic citations of *3 Baruch* are drawn from the following publications of the Slavonic MSS: Hercigonja, «Videnie Varuhovo» u Petrisovu Zborniku… 63–93; Gaylord, Slavjanskij Tekst… 49–56; Ivanov, Bogomilski knigi i legendi… 193–200; Лавров, Откровение Варуха… 149–151; Novakovic, Otkrivene Varuhovo… 203–209; Соколов, Апокрифическое откровение Варуха… 201–258; Тихонравов, Откровение Варуха… 48–54.

[16] É. Puech, Qumrân Grotte 4 (XXII): Textes Araméens, Première Partie, 4Q529–546 (Oxford, 2001) (DJD, 31); J. Milik, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments from Qumran Cave 4 (Oxford, 1976): K. Beyer, Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer (Göttingen, 1984); idem, Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband (Göttingen, 1994); F. García Martínez, Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran (Leiden, 1992) (STDJ, 9); J. Reeves, Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmology: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions (Cincinnati, 1992) (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College, 14); L. Stuckenbruck, The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary (Tübingen, 1997) (TSAJ, 63).

the Manichean *Book of Giants*,[17] and the later Jewish text known as the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*.[18]

In these materials associated with the *Book of Giants*, we find the themes of the planting and the destroying of a garden. The Aramaic fragment of the *Book of Giants* from Qumran (4Q530) and the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* depict a dream in which the giant Hahyah, the son of the watcher Shemihazah, sees a certain garden planted and then destroyed.

4Q530 lines 3–12 read:

> ...Then two of them dreamed dreams, and the sleep of their eyes and come to [...] their dreams. And he said in the assembly of [his frien]ds, the Nephilin, [...in] my dream; I have seen in this night [...] gardeners and they were watering [...] numerous roo[ts] issued from their trunk [...] I watched until tongues of fire from [...] all the water and the fire burned in all [...] Here is the end of the dream.[19]

The fragment seems to depict certain gardeners planting or sustaining a garden by watering its numerous «roots». It also portrays the destruction of the same garden by water and fire. The description of both events is very fragmentary and many features of the story appear to be missing from 4Q530. Both motifs seem better preserved in the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, which provides additional important details. It refers directly to the planting of the garden by using the Hebrew verb נטע:

> ... One night the sons of Shemhazai, Hiwwa and Hiyya,[20] saw (visions) in dream, and both of them saw dreams. One saw the great stone spread over the earth... The other (son) saw a garden, *planted* (נטוע)[21] whole with (many) kinds of trees and (many) kinds of precious stones. And an angel (was seen by him) descending from the firmament with an axe in his hand, and he was cutting down all the trees, so that there remained only one tree containing three branches. When they awoke from their sleep they arose in confusion, and, going to their father, they related to him the dreams. He

[17] W. B. Henning, The Book of the Giants // *BSOAS* 11 (1943–1946) 52–74; P. O. Skjærvø, Iranian Epic and the Manichean Book of Giants. Irano-Manichaica III // *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 48/1–2 (1995) 187–223; W. Sundermann, Ein weiteres Fragment aus Manis Gigantenbuch // Hommages et opera minora 9: Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata (Leiden, 1984) (Acta Iranica 23; Second Series, 9) 491–505.

[18] I use the Hebrew texts and the English translation of the *Midrash* published in Milik, Books of Enoch... 321–328.

[19] F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar (eds.), The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition. 2 vols (Leiden—New York—Cologne, 1997) Vol. 2. 1063.

[20] = Hahyah.

[21] Trans. Milik, Books of Enoch... 325.

> said to them: «The Holy One is about to bring a flood upon the world, and to destroy it, so that there will remain but one man and his three sons».[22]

Besides 4Q530 and the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, the Hahyah/Hiyya dream is mentioned also in the Middle Persian Kawân fragment *j* of the Manichean *Book of Giants* published by W. B. Henning. The evidence, however, is very terse and ambiguous,[23] containing only one line: «Nariman[24] saw a gar[den full of] trees in rows. Two hundred... came out, the trees…».[25]

Henning suggests that this fragment should be interpreted in the light of another Middle Persian fragment *D* (M 625c) which links the Watchers with the trees:

> ...outside... and... left... read the dream we have seen. Thereupon Enoch thus ... and the trees that come out, those are the Egregoroi, and the giants that came out of the women. And... over... pulled out... over...[26]

Several important details in these descriptions from Jewish and Manichean sources should be clarified. The first concerns the subjects planting the garden. 4Q530 refers to the gardeners watering numerous roots issued from their trunk. Who are these gardeners? J. Milik was first to identify the «gardeners» as *angelic* beings. He argued that the gardeners are «guardian angels» or «bailiffs of the world-garden» and are matched by the shepherds in the *Book of Dreams* in *1 Enoch* 89:59 and 90:1.[27] L. Stuckenbruck agrees that the «gardeners» might be angelic beings but notes that there is reason to question whether the «gardeners» are meant to represent *good* angelic beings. He suggests that in light of 4Q530 line 8 the ultimate outcome of the «gardeners'» work seems to be the production of «great shoots» from the root source, which, in Stuckenbruck's opinion, signifies «the birth of the giants from the women». He further argues that «watering» activity is a metaphor for impregnation and the «gardeners», in fact, represent fallen angelic beings, the Watchers.[28] J. Reeves had earlier suggested that the «gardeners» might represent the Watchers prior to their apostasy. He notes that the image of the gardeners «watering» the garden may allude to the initial educational mission of the Watchers, who, according to *Jub.* 4:15, were originally sent by God on earth to instruct humans in moral conduct.[29]

---

[22] Milik, Books of Enoch… 328.

[23] In view of its extremely fragmentary nature, this evidence can be considered only as tentative.

[24] = Hahyah.

[25] Trans. Henning, Book of the Giants… 57 and 60.

[26] Ibid. 66.

[27] Milik, Books of Enoch… 304.

[28] Stuckenbruck, Book of Giants from Qumran… 114.

[29] Reeves, Jewish Lore… 95, 96.

The second detail of the description concerns the imagery of the trees. It seems that the trees symbolize not the vegetation, but the inhabitants of the garden: angelic, human, or composite creatures. Arboreal metaphors are often used in Enochic tradition to describe the Watchers and the Giants (cf. *CD* 2.17–19).

Another important detail is found in the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael,* in which the destruction of the garden is associated with the flood and Noah's escape from it. 4Q530 line 10 also seems to allude to the flood, since Hahyah's dream mentions the destruction of the garden by fire and *water*. A short Qumran fragment, 6Q8, also provides evidence for the connection of Hahyah's dream with Noah's escape. F. García Martínez observes that the reference to Noah and his sons in the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* has its equivalent in 6Q8 line 2,[30] which speaks of three shoots preserved from the flood so as to signify the escape of Noah and his three sons.[31]

J. Reeves offers the following reconstruction of the dream based on the two fragments: [32]

> Hahyah beholds in his vision a grove of trees carefully attended by gardeners. This tranquil scene is interrupted by the sudden appearance (or transformation?) of two hundred figures within this garden. The result of this invasion was the production of «great» shoots sprouting up from the roots of the trees. While Hahyah viewed this scene, emissaries from Heaven arrived and ravaged the garden with water and fire, leaving only one tree bearing three branches as the sole survivor of the destruction.[33]

A comparison of this description from the *Book of Giants* with the story found in the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch* 4 shows that both accounts seem to have three similar events that follow one another in the same sequence: the planting of the garden, the destruction of the garden, and the escape of one tree from the destruction. These intriguing similarities call for a more thorough investigation of the parallels between the garden traditions found in the *3 Baruch* 4 and the *Book of Giants*.

---

[30] 6Q8 line 2: «its three roots [...and] while I was [watching] came [...] all this orchard, and [...]» (García Martínez, Tigchelaar, Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition… Vol. 2. 1149).

[31] García Martínez, Qumran and Apocalyptic… 101. See also Reeves, Jewish Lore… 87 and 95; Milik, Books of Enoch… 309.

[32] Reeves, Jewish Lore… 95–96; Stuckenbruck, Book of Giants from Qumran… 114–115. It should be noted that any arrangement of the fragments must be considered tentative. On this issue, see L. T. Stuckenbruck, The Sequencing of Fragments Belonging to the Qumran *Book of Giants*: An Inquiry into the Structure and Purpose of an Early Jewish Composition // *JSP* 16 (1997) 3–24, esp. 10.

[33] Reeves, Jewish Lore… 95.

III. The Angelic Planting of the Garden (*3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7–8)

The motif of angels planting the garden is uniquely preserved in the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch*.[34] In the text, the tale about the planting comes from the mouth of Baruch's angelic guide. From him the visionary learns that God commanded Michael to gather two hundred thousand and three angels in order to plant the garden. The story further tells that Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, Raphael and Sataniel planted five trees. Other angels also planted «various trees».

Several features in the story of the planting found in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7–8 seem to resonate with the account found in the *Book of Giants*. These details include the following significant points:

1. *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7 mentions two hundred thousand and three angels planting the garden;
2. the fallen angel Sataniel also takes part in planting the «trees»;
3. according to the story, Sataniel plants the bad tree — the tree of deception;
4. the tree is described as a sinful desire that the fallen angel had for humans;
5. *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7 mentions the planting of five types of trees in the garden.

1. The first feature of *3 Baruch* 4 that recalls the *Book of Giants* is the number of angelic hosts involved in planting the garden. *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7 tells that God commanded Michael[35] to gather two hundred thousand and three angels in order to plant the garden. The numeral two hundred thousand and three, reserved here for the number of angelic hosts, gives a clue to the reader that the angelic «gardeners» described in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7 are somehow related to the fallen Watchers, who in the *Book of Giants* «planted» gigantic «trees» on the earth through their iniquities.[36] In early Enochic ac-

[34] The Greek version contains only a very short reference to Samael's planting of the tree: «It is the vine which the angel Samael planted (ἐφύτευσεν) by which the Lord God became angered, and he cursed him and his planting (τὴν φυτείαν αὐτοῦ)». Gaylord, 3 Baruch… 667; see also Picard, Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece… 85.

[35] The commissioning of Michael for the mission of gathering two hundred thousand angels might allude to Michael's role in the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 Enoch* 10:11–15) where he is responsible for the affairs connected with Shemihazah and the Watchers.

[36] That three angels are mentioned in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7 in conjunction with the two hundred thousand angels might be a reference to a tradition in which the three principal angels (Raphael, Uriel, Gabriel) were called by the fourth principal angel, Michael, to fulfill God's command to plant the garden. Another explanation of the angelic triad in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7 is that is could represent the leaders of the Watchers group.

counts, the numeral «two hundred» often refers to the number of the Watchers descending on Mount Hermon.[37] Some later Enochic accounts, however, tend to exaggerate the number of the fallen Watchers, depicting them as two hundred thousand or two hundred myriads. For example, in the longer recension *2 Enoch* 18:3, the angelic guides give Enoch the following information about the Watchers: «These are the *Gregori* (Watchers), who turned aside from the Lord, 200 myriads, together with their prince Satanail».[38] It is noteworthy that in *3 Baruch* 4, similar to *2 Enoch* 18, the tradition about the two hundred myriads of angelic beings is creatively conflated with the name of Sataniel.[39]

2. In *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7–8, one of the angelic creatures planting the garden along with the four principal angels (Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, and Raphael) is the fallen angel Sataniel. The description of Sataniel as the gardener is puzzling. The pseudepigraphic texts usually follow the biblical account[40] that claims that the garden was planted by God (Gen 2:8).[41] This motif of the fallen «planter» might, therefore, parallel the *Book of Giants*, where the fallen angels are also depicted as gardeners.

The later Enochic accounts often speak about *three*, not two, leaders of the fallen Watchers. See *3 Enoch* 4:5–6 «...And the Holy One, blessed be he, appointed me [Enoch] in the height as a prince and a ruler among the ministering angels. Then three of ministering angels, Uzzah, Azzah, and Azael, came and laid charges against me in the heavenly height» (P. Alexander, 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 258). See also *3 Enoch* 5:9 «...it was only because Uzaah, Azzah, and Azael taught them sorceries that they brought them down and employed them, for otherwise they would not have been able to bring them down» (OTP. Vol 1. 260). Annette Yoshiko Reed, From Asael and Šemihazah to Uzzah, Azzah, and Azael: 3 Enoch 5 (§§ 7–8) and Jewish Reception-History of *1 Enoch* // *JSQ* 8/2 (2001) 105–136, esp. 110, argues that the tradition about Uzzah, Azzah, and Azael reflects «direct knowledge of the account of the fall of the angels in *1 Enoch* 6–11».

[37] See *1 Enoch* 6:6: «And they were in all two hundred, and they came down on Ardis which is the summit of Mount Hermon». (M. Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch. 2 vols. (Oxford, 1978) Vol. 2. 68).

[38] F. I. Andersen, 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // OTP. Vol. 1. 130.

[39] The possibility that the author of *3 Baruch* was cognizant of the myth of the Watchers is supported also by the information found in other parts of the book. According to Bauckham («Early Jewish Visions of Hell», 372) the author of *3 Bar* indeed knew about the story of the Watchers. He suggests that two groups of condemned angels in chaps. 2 and 3 of *3 Baruch* parallel two groups of Watchers in the second and fifth heaven from *2 Enoch* 7 and 18.

[40] I am indebted to Professor Michael Stone for this clarification.

[41] See also 4Q504 8:4–6 «... [...Adam,] our [fat]her, you fashioned in the image of [your] glory [...] [...the breath of life] you [b]lew into his nostril, and intelligence and knowledge [...] [...in the gard]en of Eden, which you had planted...» (García Martínez, Tigchelaar, Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition… Vol. 2. 1009.

3. In *3 Baruch* and in the *Book of Giants*, the «planting of trees/tree» is part of the angelic plot to corrupt the human race. In the *Book of Giants*, the «gardeners», represented by fallen angelic beings, «plant» bad «trees» — the wicked offspring that, through their enormous appetites, brought many disasters to the antedeluvian generation. In *3 Baruch* 4, the «gardener», the fallen angel Sataniel, also plants a tree designed to cause the fall and degradation of the human race. In *3 Baruch*, the vine tree eventually becomes the tool through which Adam and Eve were deceived and corrupted.

4. The account in *3 Baruch* connects the tree planted by Sataniel with the «sinful desire» spread by this fallen angel over the first humans. In 4:8, the *angelus interpres* tells Baruch that «in the first place, the tree was the vine, but secondly, the tree (is) sinful desire[42] which Sataniel spread over Adam and Eve».[43] This reference to the «sinful desire» of the fallen angel over humans is intriguing since it alludes to the terminology found in Enochic tradition. Thus *1 Enoch* 6 says that the Watchers had sinful desire for human creatures.[44] The *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* also uses the term «evil desire» or «evil inclination» (Heb. יצר הרע) in reference to the relationships between the descended Watchers and the «daughters of man»:

> Forthwith the Holy One allowed the *evil inclination* (יצר הרע) to rule over them, as soon as they descended. When they beheld the daughters of man that they were beautiful, they began to corrupt themselves with them, as it is said, «When the sons of God saw the daughters of man», they could not restrain their inclination.[45]

In the story from the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, the evil desire of the Watchers over humans seems to come as consequence of the Watchers' disrespect for humanity in general and the first human creature in particular.[46] It is intriguing that some Russian manuscripts of *3 Baruch* contain the

---

[42] Slav. **похоть грѣховнаю**. (Novakovic, Otkrivene Varuhovo… 206).

[43] Gaylord, 3 Baruch… 666.

[44] *1 Enoch* 6:1–2a: «And it came to pass, when the sons of men had increased, that in those days there were born to them fair and beautiful daughters. And the angels, the sons of heaven, saw them and desired them». (Knibb, Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 2. 67).

[45] Trans. Milik, Books of Enoch… 327.

[46] *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* 1–4: «When the generation of Enosh arose and practiced idolatry and when the generation of the flood arose and corrupted their actions, the Holy One — Blessed be He — was grieved that He had created man, as it is said, "And God repented that he created man, and He grieved at heart". Forthwith arose two angels, whose names were Shemhazai and Azael, and said before Him: "O Lord of the universe, did we not say unto Thee when Thou didst create Thy world, 'Do not create man'?" The Holy One — Blessed be He — said to them; "Then what shall become of the world?" They said before Him: "We will suffice (Thee)

passage about Sataniel's refusal[47] to venerate Adam,[48] which recalls the account found in *Midrash* 1–4.[49] Gaylord, however, does not include this account in his English translation of the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch* in *OTP*, considering it to be a later interpolation.

5. Finally, *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7 refers to five kinds of trees. The text says that the olive tree was planted by Michael, the apple by Gabriel, the nut by Uriel, the melon by Raphael, and the vine by Sataniel. Although the number of the principal angels seems unusual, the reference to the «five trees» excites interest in light of a passage found among the fragments of the Manichean *Book of Giants* published by W. B. Henning. This fragment, similar to *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7, also operated with the notion of the «five trees»: «...evil-intentioned…from where...he came. The Misguided fail to recognize the five elements, [the five kinds of] trees, the five (kinds of) animals» (frag. h).[50]

---

instead of it". He said: "It is revealed and (well) known to me that if peradventure you had lived in that (earthly) world, the evil inclination would have ruled you just as much as it rules over the sons of man, but you would be more stubborn than they". They said before Him: "Give us Thy sanction and let us descend {and dwell} among the creatures and then Thou shall see how we shall sanctify Thy name". He said to them: "Descend and dwell ye among them". Forthwith the Holy One allowed the evil inclination to rule over them, as soon as they descended. When they beheld the daughters of man that they were beautiful, they began to corrupt themselves with them, as it is said, "When the sons of God saw the daughters of man", they could not restrain their inclination» (trans. Milik, Books of Enoch… 327).

[47] The Adamic Story of Satan's refusal to venerate Adam is attested in many Jewish, Christian, and Muslim materials, including Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve* 13–15; *Gospel of Bartholomew* 4; Coptic *Enthronement of Michael*; *Cave of Treasures* 2:10–24; and *Qur'an* 2:31–39; 7:11–18; 15:31–48; 17:61–65; 18:50; 20:116–123; 38:71–85. On Satan's refusal, see M. Stone, The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the Books of Adam and Eve // *JTS* 44 (1993) 145–148; G. Anderson, The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan // *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 6 (1997) 105–134.

[48] «And he said to Michael, "Sound the trumpet for the angels to assemble and bow down to the work of my hands which I made". And the angel Michael sounded the trumpet, and all the angels assembled, and all bowed down to Adam order by order. But Sataniel did not bow down and said, "To mud and dirt I will never bow down". And he said, "I will establish my throne above the clouds and I will be like the highest". Because of that, God cast him and his angels from his face just as the prophet said, "These withdrew from his face, all who hate God and the glory of God". And God commanded an angel to guard Paradise» (Gaylord, How Sataniel Lost His '-el'… 305).

[49] «Forthwith arose two angels, whose names were Shemhazai and Azael, and said before Him: "O Lord of the universe, did we not say unto Thee when Thou didst create Thy world, Do not create man?"» (trans. Milik, Books of Enoch… 327).

[50] Trans. Henning, Book of the Giants… 63.

In both Enochic and Adamic accounts, the flooded garden is depicted as a place where the drama of the primordial evil unfolds. Enochic and Adamic traditions often compete with each other, offering different explanations of the origin of evil in the world.[51] The Enochic tradition bases its understanding of the origin of evil on the story of the Watchers, in which the descended Watchers corrupt human beings by passing on to them various celestial secrets. By contrast, the Adamic story traces the source of evil to the fall of Adam and Eve in Eden. These two accounts share many common details that reveal a persistent and strenuous polemic between the two traditions. The description in *3 Baruch* 4 of the flooded garden as the arena of the primordial heavenly rebellion involving angelic beings of the highest status brings the two traditions closer together.

IV. The Flood in the Garden (*3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:10–11)

In *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:8, the angel tells the visionary about the evil role the vine tree played in Sataniel's deception of Adam and Eve. According to the story, God, as a result of this deception, cursed the vine and its seed. Upon hearing this story, Baruch asked the angel why, despite God's curse, the vine can still exist. The angel told Baruch about the flood in the heavenly garden.

The story recounts that God first caused the flood upon the earth, which led to the drowning of «every firstling», including 104,000 giants. Then the water rose above the highest mountains and flooded the heavenly garden. As God withdrew the water, «all flower» was destroyed except for one shoot from the vine. When the land appeared from the water, Noah went out from his ark and discovered the vine lying on the ground.

Several points of this flood story resemble the account found in the *Book of Giants*, including the following details:

> 1. In *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:10 and in the *Book of Giants*, the flooding of the garden is parallel to the flood on the earth.
> 2. In both traditions the destruction of all vegetation (in *3 Baruch* «all flower»[52]) in the garden «mirrors» the destruction of all flesh and the giants on earth.
> 3. In both traditions the surviving «plant» from the flooded garden is parallel to the escape of Noah from the flood.

1. Later rabbinic materials sometimes operate with the notion of two gardens: the celestial garden of Eden and the terrestrial garden. In *3 Enoch* 5:5–

[51] M. E. Stone, The Axis of History at Qumran // Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls / Ed. E. Chazon, M. E. Stone (Leiden, 1999) (STDJ, 31) 133–149.

[52] Slav. **вьсь цвѣтъ** (Gaylord, Slavjanskij Tekst… 52).

6 we learn that before the generation of Enosh had sinned, God's *Shekinah* freely traveled from one garden to the other:

> When the Holy One, blessed be he, went out and in from the garden to Eden, and from Eden to the garden, from the garden to heaven, and from heaven to the garden of Eden, all gazed at the bright image of *Shekinah* and were unharmed — until the coming of the generation of Enosh, who was the chief of all the idolaters in the world. [53]

The story of the garden in *3 Baruch* 4 might represent an early tradition about the two gardens, since in this apocalypse the garden becomes the locus of celestial and terrestrial events at the same time. In the story of the flood in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:10–11, the events taking place in heaven and on earth are depicted as if they were to mirror each other: the destruction of «all flesh», including the giants on earth, «mirrors» the destruction of «all flower» in the heavenly garden. Both accounts also mention survivors, the patriarch Noah from the flooded earth and one plant from the flooded heavenly garden. This parallelism resembles the one in the *Book of Giants*, where the dream(s) about the destroyed «vegetation» of the garden and the single preserved shoot symbolized the drowned giants and Noah's miraculous escape.

2. As we mentioned above, in the Enochic traditions the fallen angels and their offspring are often depicted through arboreal imagery. CD 2.17–19 refers to the giants as tall cedars.[54] The *Book of Giants* supports this tendency: in the Manichean fragments of this composition, the Watchers are unambiguously associated with the trees.[55] The *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* also seems to take the vegetation of the garden as a symbol of the Watchers/Giants group. This correspondence is made not directly but through parallelism. In the *Midrash*, Shemhazai's statement about the flood on earth follows immediately after Hiyya's dream about the destruction of the trees. The two events seem to «mirror» each other in such a way that the first depicts the second symbolically.

3 Apoc. Bar. 4:10 follows the same pattern, portraying the destruction of «all flesh» and the giants on earth and the destruction of «all flower» in the heavenly garden as two «mirroring» processes taking place in the celestial

---

[53] Trans. Alexander, 3 Enoch… 260.

[54] «For having walked in the stubbornness of their hearts the Watchers of the heaven fell; on account of it they were caught, for they did not heed the precepts of God. And their sons, whose height was like that of cedars and whose bodies were like mountains, fell». (García Martínez, Tigchelaar, Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition… Vol. 1. 555).

[55] «...outside... and... left... read the dream we have seen. Thereupon Enoch thus... and the trees that come out, those are the Egregoroi, and the giants that came out of the women. And... over... pulled out... over…». (Henning, Book of the Giants… 66).

and terrestrial realms. The similarities between the descriptions in *3 Baruch* 4 and the *Book of Giants* seem not to be coincidental. In addition, the description of «all flesh» in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:10 includes a direct reference to the drowned giants.[56]

3. The next is the identification of Noah with the «escaped plant». In the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, the giant Hiyya beholds in his dream one tree with three branches that survived the destruction of the garden. The text tells that «an angel (was seen by him) descending from the firmament with an axe in his hand, and he was cutting down all trees, so that there remained only one tree containing three branches».[57] A verse later, the story switches to Noah and his three sons:[58] «He [Shemhazai] said to them [Hiwwa and Hiyya]: "The Holy One is about to bring a flood upon the world, and to destroy it, so that there will remain but one man and his three sons"».[59] In *Midrash* 10b–11a, the reference to Noah and his three sons enduring the flood follows immediately after the symbolic depiction of the tree with three branches surviving the destruction. Although the *Midrash* does not directly identify the tree with Noah, it makes the indentification obvious by correlating these two descriptions.

The same correlation is seen in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:10b–11, where the reference to Noah and his escape follows immediately after the statement about the preserved shoot: «and the water entered into the garden and destroyed every flower, bringing out one shoot from the vine as God withdrew the waters. And there was dry land, and Noah went out from the ark».[60] It is important, however, that the escaped «tree», which in the *Book of Giants* was associated with the righteous remnant, becomes associated in *3 Baruch* with the evil deception. This difference might point to the polemical character of *3 Baruch*'s appropriation of Enochic imagery.

---

[56] It is possible that *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:3 also attests to the traditions of the giants. The text says that Baruch's angelic guide showed him a serpent who «drinks one cubit of water from the sea every day, and it eats earth like grass». This description might allude to the appetites of the giants who were notorious for consuming everything alive on the surface of the earth. The *Book of the Watchers* and the *Book of Giants* also attest to the enormous appetites of the giants. The *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* has it that «each of them eats daily a thousand camels, a thousand horses, a thousand oxen, and all kinds (of animals)» (trans. Milik, Books of Enoch… 328).

[57] Trans. Milik, Books of Enoch… 328.

[58] Associations of Noah with the plant abound, e.g., *1 Enoch* 10:16: «Destroy all wrong from the face of the earth .... And let the plant of righteousness and truth appear» (Knibb, Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 2. 90). For a survey of the evidence, see Reeves, Jewish Lore… 99–100. Scholars believe that 6Q8 line 2 also refers to the story of Noah and his three sons.

[59] Trans. Milik, Books of Enoch… 328.

[60] Trans. Gaylord, 3 Baruch… 666.

V. The Noachic Narrative (*3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:11–15)

3 Apoc. Bar. 4:11–15 deals with Noah's story. It depicts the patriarch after his debarkation seeing the shoot of vine lying on the ground. Noah hesitates to plant the vine, knowing the fatal role this plant had in deceiving Adam and Eve. Puzzled, Noah decides to ask the Lord in prayer if he can plant the vine. The Lord sends the angel Sarasael, who delivers to Noah the following command: «Rise, Noah, and plant the vine, and alter its name and change it for the better».[61] Sarasael's address to Noah is important for establishing the connection between *3 Baruch* 4 and the broader Enochic/Noahic traditions. It reveals that the author of *3 Baruch* was familiar not only with the details of Noah's escape from the flood that are found in the extant materials of the *Book of Giants* but also with the peculiar details of Noah's story in the *Book of the Watchers* and in the traditions associated with the *Book of Noah*.

The Greek and Ethiopic versions of *1 Enoch* 10:1–3 attest that God commissioned Sariel to inform Noah about the approaching flood.[62] This story might possibly parallel Sarasael's[63] revelation to Noah in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:15, but Sariel's revelation in *1 Enoch* 10:1–3 does not contain any information about the plant. It may be, however, that the «original» reading of *1 Enoch* 10:3 survived in its entirety not in the Ethiopic text of *1 Enoch* but in the text preserved by Syncellus,[64] which corresponds closely to the Aramaic evidence.[65] In the passage found in Syncellus, God commissioned Sariel to tell Noah not only about his escape from the flood but also about a *plant*: «And now instruct the righteous one what to do, and the son of Lamech, that he may save his life and escape for all time; and from him a plant shall be planted and established for all generations for ever».[66]

---

[61] Gaylord, 3 Baruch… 668.

[62] *1 Enoch* 10:1–3: «And then the Most High, the Great and Holy One, spoke and sent Arsyalalyur to the son of Lamech, and said to him: Say to him in my name "Hide yourself", and reveal to him the end which is coming, for the whole earth will be destroyed, and a deluge is about to come on all the earth, and what is in it will be destroyed. And now teach him that he may escape, and (that) his offspring may survive for the whole earth» (Knibb, Ethiopic Book of Enoch… Vol. 2. 87).

[63] Sarasael represents here the corruption of Sariel, the angelic name of the archangel Uriel also known in various traditions under the name of Phanuel. On the Uriel/Sariel/Phanuel connection, see A. Orlov, The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob* // Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture. 2 vols / Ed. C. A. Evans (London, 2004) (Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity, 9) Vol. 2. 59–76.

[64] M. Black, The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch (Leiden, 1985) (SVTP, 7) 133, observes that «the longer text of Sync. seems closer to an original».

[65] Milik, Books of Enoch… 161–162.

[66] Black, Book of Enoch… 30.

Although «a plant» in this revelation can be taken as a symbolic reference to the restored humanity[67] or to Noah himself, who is described in *1 Enoch* 10:16 as the «plant of righteousness and truth», some texts associated with Enochic traditions reveal that, besides «planting» justice and righteousness, Noah was involved literally in the planting of the vine. Thus, *Jub.* 7:1, for example, says that «during the seventh week, in its first year, in this jubilee Noah planted a vine at the mountain (whose name was Lubar, one of the mountains of Ararat) on which the ark had come to rest. It produced fruit in the fourth year».[68] Here, just as in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:13–15, the planting of the vine is associated with Noah's debarkation.

Noah's story as found in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:11–16 gives additional support to the hypothesis about the existence of the materials associated with the *Book of Noah*. F. García Martínez's pioneering research demonstrates that the materials of the *Book of Noah* are closely associated with the Enochic/Noachic traditions found in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, the Qumran materials, and Syncellus.[69] In *3 Baruch* 4 several traditions associated with the *Book of Noah* appear to be intimately interconnected, which may point to their common origin in the *Book of Noah*. For example, In *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:15–17, Sarasael tells Noah about the dangers of the vine. The angel tells him that the plant still retains its evil. This revelation about *the plant and the evil it possesses* recalls another passage possibly associated with the *Book of Noah*, namely, the tradition about the angelic revelation to Noah recorded in *Jub.* 10:1–14, which has it that Noah was taught by angels about *the plants and evil spirits*.[70]

[67] P. A. Tiller, The «Eternal Planting» in the Dead Sea Scrolls // *DSD* 4.3 (1997) 312–313, esp. 317. See also S. Fujita, The Metaphor of Plant in Jewish Literature of the Intertestamental Period // *JSJ* 7 (1976) 30–45.

[68] J. C. VanderKam, The Book of Jubilees. 2 vols (Leuven, 1989) (CSCO, 510–511; Scriptores Aethiopici, 87–88) Vol. 2. 43.

[69] García Martínez, Qumran and Apocalyptic… 1–44. Even though the *Book of Noah* is not listed in the ancient catalogues of the apocryphal books, the writings attributed to Noah are mentioned in such early materials as the *Book of Jubilees* (*Jub.* 10:13; 21:10) the *Genesis Apocryphon* from Qumran, and the Greek fragment of the Levi document from Mount Athos. In addition to the titles of the lost *Book of Noah*, several fragmentary materials associated with the early Noachic traditions have survived. Most researchers agree that some parts of the lost *Book of Noah* «have been incorporated into *1 Enoch* and Jubilees and that some manuscripts of Qumran preserve some traces of it» (García Martínez, Qumran and Apocalyptic… 26).

[70] *Jub.* 10:11b–14 «All of the evil ones who were savage we tied up in the place of judgement, while we left a tenth of them to exercise power on the earth before the satan. We told Noah all the medicines for their diseases with their deceptions so that he could cure (them) by means of the earth's plants. Noah wrote down in a book everything (just) as we had taught him regarding all the kinds of medicine, and the evil spirits were precluded from pursuing Noah's children. He gave all the books that he had written to his oldest son Shem because he loved him much more than all his sons» (VanderKam, Book of Jubilees… Vol. 2. 60).

VI. Conclusion

1. The foregoing analysis has demonstrated a number of intriguing parallels between the theme of the garden in *3 Baruch* 4 and similar traditions associated with the materials of the *Book of Giants*.[71] In both accounts, the garden is depicted as the place of the primordial heavenly rebellion involving angelic being(s). Although *3 Baruch* 4 is written from the Adamic perspective,[72] this account demonstrates several details that are absent from «traditional» Adamic accounts but can be found in the Enochic tradition. This suggests that the author of *3 Baruch* might be involved in anti-Enochic polemics, borrowing and rewriting Enochic motifs and themes from the Adamic perspective. Therefore, the story of the planting and the destruction of the garden in *3 Baruch* seems to represent the locus of intense debates involving substantial rewriting of the «original» Enochic/Noahic motifs and themes. The details of the Enochic Watchers/Giants story appear to be rearranged[73] and transferred to new characters of the Adamic story, including Samael/Sataniel and the serpent.[74]

2. The author of *3 Baruch* seems to be engaged in anti-Enochic polemics not only with the traditions associated with the *Book of Giants* but also with the Enochic motifs and themes found in the *Book of the Watchers*, the *Book of Jubilees*, and Syncellus. It appears that even the theme of the flooding of the heavenly garden represents an anti-Enochic motif. *Jubilees* 4 depicts Enoch as the one who was translated to the garden of Eden. *Jubilees* 4:23 further tells that because of Enoch «the flood water did not come on any of the land of Eden because he was placed there as a sign and to testify against all people in order to tell all the deeds of history until the day of judgment».[75]

---

[71] The analysis demonstrates that, among the Jewish and Manichean materials associated with the *Book of Giants*, the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* shows the closest proximity to the traditions about the garden found in *3 Baruch* 4.

[72] *3 Baruch* 4 appears to be one of the texts where the Adamic tradition plays a prominent role. Scholars have previously noted that Adamic and Enochic/Noachic traditions often compete with each other, offering different interpretations of the origins of evil in the world and the agents responsible for the transgression. In the course of the long-lasting polemics about these matters, Adamic and Enochic traditions often allude reciprocally to the motifs and themes of both. For a detailed discussion of this subject, see Stone, Axis of History at Qumran… 133–149.

[73] Harlow, Greek Apocalypse of Baruch… 59, noted that the author of *3 Baruch* 4 «put the Watchers' myth on its head».

[74] The depiction of the serpent in *3 Baruch* seems to allude to the enormous appetites of the giants; see *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:3 «And he showed me a plain, and there was a serpent on a stone mountain. And it drinks one cubit of water from the sea every day, and it eats earth like grass» (Gaylord, 3 Baruch… 666).

[75] VanderKam, Book of Jubilees… Vol. 2. 28.

3. A substantial part of *3 Baruch* 4 is occupied by the Noachic account, and the Noachic tradition found in *3 Baruch* 4 is closely connected with the fragments of the *Book of Noah* found in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, the Dead Sea Scroll fragments, and Syncellus. It appears, however, that the Noachic materials found in *3 Baruch* 4 have also undergone the «Adamic» revisions. H. E. Gaylord observes that «a strong typological relation is set up between Adam and Noah, who discovers a piece of the vine through which Adam and Eve sinned washed out of the garden by the receding floodwaters».[76]

ABSTRACT

The article investigates the the story about the planting and destruction of the heavenly garden found in the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch*. The study shows a number of intriguing parallels between the theme of the garden in *3 Baruch* and similar traditions found in the Enochic *Book of Giants*. In both accounts, the garden is depicted as the place of the primordial heavenly rebellion involving angelic beings. The study argues that the author of *3 Baruch* is involved in anti-Enochic polemics, borrowing and rewriting Enochic motifs and themes from the Adamic perspective. The story of the planting and the destruction of the garden in *3 Baruch* seems to represent the locus of intense debates involving substantial rewriting of the «original» Enochic motifs and themes.

[76] Gaylord, 3 Baruch… 659.

SCRINIUM III (2007)

Журнал

Адрес редакции:
Т. А. Сениной («Scrinium»)
а/я 110, Санкт-Петербург, 194352, Россия

E-mail: mon.kassia@gmail.com

Утверждено к печати
Санкт-Петербургским Обществом византино-славянских исследований
(198097, С.-Петербург, Промышленная ул., 38/2)
и
ООО «МЦФ Международный Центр Фантастики»
(Моеква, 111250, ул. Краеноказарменная, д. 9, нодъезд 9)

Технический редактор: *Т. А. Сенина*

Оформление и оригинал-макет: *Т. А. Сенина*

Оригинал-макет подготовлен в программе PageMaker 6.5,
с использованием шрифтов Byzantina Plain, GaramondC, PalatinoC,
LiteraturnayaC, AGOptimaCyr, Times New Roman, TransRoman,
Kirillica Wincyr, Graeca, SPIonic, EEstrangelo,
SPTiberian, Hebraica.

Подниеано к нечати 12.02.2007.
Формат $70\times100/_{16}$. Печать офеетная. 34 н. л. Тираж 500 экз. Заказ №

Отпечатано с готовых диапозитивов в ГИПП «Искусство России»
198099, Санкт-Петербург, Промышлеппая ул., 38/2.

Printed in Rnssia